श्री मुफ्ती मोहम्मद सईद: हम यह कह देंगे अगर मुमकिन हो सके वो लिख कर दें कि We do not require any protection.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: गृह मंत्री जी, जब तक लिख कर मांगी न गई हो प्रोटेक्शन वो लिख कर दे नहीं सकता कि प्रोटेक्शन नहीं चाहिये। यह आपका फर्ज़ बनता है आप अपने गुप्तचर विभाग से पता लगाइये कि कौन खतरे में है। उसको सुरक्षा देना आपका काम है। **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मुफ्ती मोहम्मद सईद: नहीं, नहीं, अगर वो मांगे नहीं तो कैसे **(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is over. Please sit down. Mr. Narayanasamy, don't just make a habit of getting up for no reason.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): I am on a genuine clarification.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No Please sit down.

You should be thankful to the Home Minister that he came on your request. Instead of thanking him ...(*Interruptions*)

Now, the Prime Minister. Statement on Bofors. It is a statement, not the discussion here. He is going to make a statement in this House as he made in the other House. Then we will have Half-an-Hour Discussion on that. I will combine both together.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

I. Bofors Gun Deal Issue

II. Half-an-hour Discussion on Points Arising out of the Answer given in the Rajya Sabha on the 26th December, 1989, to Starred Question 25 Regarding Commission Paid by AB Bofors in 155mm Howitzer Gun Deal.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Madam, Ever since the news broke in April, 1987 that large payments had been made as commissions by Bofors into secret Swiss bank accounts in connection with the 155 mm gun contract with the Government of India, the entire nation has been most anxious to know all the facts. The Government of India immediately came out with the statement that the news-item was false, baseless and mischievous. The then Government also said that during negotiations it had "made it clear that the company should not pay any money to any person in connection with the contract." Many felt assured that the Government would deal effectively with the culprits because the statement also promised that "any breach of this policy by anyone will be most severely dealt with".

A few days later in April, 1987, the then Minister of Defence stated in Parliament that Government did not approve of the appointment of Indian agents acting for foreign suppliers and that the Defence Secretary had told the companies bidding for the contract that the Government of India will disqualify a firm in case it comes to its notice that an agent had been appointed by a foreign firm.

The Report of the Swedish National Audit bureau was made available to Government in June, 1987. Even though a vital portion of this Report was withheld by the Swedish Government, it clearly established that very large payments had been made by Bofors to various persons in connection with the Indian contract. This demolished the then Government's case that the allegations earlier made in the media were false and baseless.

The records show that there was a flurry of activity on the receipt of the Swedish National Audit Bureau Report. The then Government immediately took the decision to go about setting up a Joint Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the whole matter. The then Rajya Sabha Raksha Mantri, Shri Arun Singh, recorded a note on 10th June, 1987, which I would like to quote in full. It reads as follows:—

"On 4 June, in meeting held in PLO,

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

we were informed that the Swedish Government had forwarded a copy of their National Audit Bureau Report on the 'Bofors' case to our Government and that the Swedish were going to make the document public based on various discussions held in CCPA, Cabinet and with opposition leaders, Government of India announced its decision to establish a Parliamentary Committee to examine the Swedish findings etc. Since then no further discussions have been held with us and no further announcements made. In Sum, the Sweden have confirmed the following:—

(a) Payments of 100000 SAK per month to Anatronic General Corporation in India.

(b) Payments of 31.5 million SAK to an account in Switzerland in November/ December's 86. The payee is not stated but could be 'Lotus' (whoever that is?)

(c) Payments of something between 175—250 million SAK as 'winding-up' charges to 'others'.

In replying to the debate in the Rajya Sabha, I had made the following basic points:—

(a) GOI policy was that no payments were to be made to anyone as commission in relation to this contract.

(b) This policy had been communicated both to the company (Bofors) and to the Swedish Government.

(c) This communication had been understood by both those parties and they had recommended that understanding to us.

(d) Therefore, if any payments had been made, "there must be something wrong with that payment".

Taking this logic further, I then went on to say that we as Government are very interested in finding out if anything has been paid and, to quote; "If we find something has been paid, we will definitely pursue each of these questions: what? when? where? how? to whom? and why?". It is my understanding that the National Audit Bureau Report has confirmed unequivocally that payments have been made and I stand by my statement in the Rajya Sabha that such payments are grossly violative of all stated GOI policy as communicated to and understood by both Bofors and the Swedish Government. It must therefore follow that we as GOI must pursue this matter to a logical conclusion in terms of the questions I myself had posed in my reply to the debate. Given the above, I have taken the liberty of asking officers of the Deptt. of Defence to draft two letters —one to Bofors and one to the Swedish Government. In these we are seeking answers to our questions. I recommend that we sent these to our Ambassador in Sweden for him to deliver. He should be told that he should inform both the Swedish Government and the company that unless they give us the information we want, we will have no alternative but to cancel the contract for the FH 77 B 155 mm Howitzers.

I am fully cognisant of the fact that this cancellation will have some negative impact on our Defence preparedness but you may like to reconfirm with CCAS whether we can live with that. In my view we must be prepared to go to this extent of cancellation because our very credibility as a Government is at stake and what is worse, the credibility of the entire process of Defence acquisitions is also at stake.

I would be most grateful if this note and the draft letters could be forwarded by you to the Prime Minister after you have seen them."

Shri Arun Singh put up this note to the then Raksha Mantri, Shri K. C. Pant, with the request that the note along with the draft letters proposed to be addressed to Bofors and to the Swedish Government be forwarded to the Prime Minister. Shri Pant signed this note in endorsement on 11th June '87 and put it up to the former Prime Minister.

On this, the former Prime Minister re-

corded a minute which reads as follows:—

"It is unfortunate that MOS/AS has put his personal prestige above the security of the nation before even evaluating all aspects. I appreciate his feelings as he had been dealing with Def. almost completely on his own with my full support but that is not adequate reason to be ready to compromise the security of the nation. Has he evaluated the actual position *vis-a-vis* security? Has he evaluated the financial loss of a cancellation? Has he evaluated the degree of breach of contract by Bofors if any? Has he evaluated the consequences for all future defence purchases if we cancel contract unilaterally? Has he evaluated how rival manufacturers will behave in the future? Has he evaluated how GOI prestige will plummet if we unilaterally cancel a contract that has not been violated? To the best of my belief the Swedish Audit report upholds GOI position and does not contradict it. What we need to do is to get to the roots and find out what precisely has been happening and who all are involved. Kneejerk reactions and stomach cramps will not serve any purpose. RRM has run the Ministry fairly well but there is no reason to panic, specially if one's conscience is clear."

Unfortunately, this minute recorded by the then Prime Minister on 15th June, 1987 was received in the Ministry of Defence only on 21st July, 1987 a few days after Shri Arun Singh bemitted office on 16th July 87. In the meantime, however communications were sent to the Swedish Government and to Bofors. The Ministry of Defence wrote a strong letter on 18th June, 1987 to Bofors charging them with violation of the contract and breach of a solemn assurance that no agent or middleman would be employed by then and demanding full and detailed information from the Company with regard to these payments.

Towards the end of June, 1987, the Ministry also sought the opinion of the Attorney General for India. In his opinion, received on 4th July, 1987, the AG expressed the view that "if AB Bofors have engaged an Indian agent, it is contrary to the condition precedent to the contract and Government of India has an option either to treat them as a breach and sue them for damages or to keep alive the contract and sue them for breach of warranty." He also maintained that there could be "no other payment which they could legitimately make for winding up of any alleged agency agreement as nothing of that sort was disclosed by them to Government of India except the service contract on payment of 100,000 SAK per month."

The AG also expressed the view that "Bofors has no right to claim that the Company has to maintain secrecy as of utmost importance especially within defence area." He said that if the matter goes into arbitration or to Court, it would be governed by Indian law and Bofors

"will be bound to disclose the particulars of the alleged middlemen and the payments made to them." The AG went on to advise that "the Government should take a firm stand even to the extent of threatening Bofors with the Consequences of termination of the contract in view of the breach committed by them of the conditions precedent to the contract." At the the same time, the AG cautioned that "in the event of cancellation, litigation by way of arbitration is inevitable. Though the Government of India has a strong case, one cannot always predict the outcome of litigation or arbitration."

The AG also noted that the Government may have to make alternative arrangements for the purchase of guns, if required. But "if Bofors persist and con tinue to adopt this persistent attitude of non-disclosure, there seems to be no other option left for the Government than taking stern steps."

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

Then there is the recommendation made by the former Chief of Army Staff, General Sundarji, conveyed in two notes in June-July, 1987. His note dated 15th July, '87 which is similar to the one recorded on 13th June, 1987 reads as follows:—

"Reference discussion in RRM(A)'s office of this morning. My views on the strategic implications are contained in the succeeding paragraphs."

"It is essential that we get the full information as to the moneys paid to various individuals by Bofors or their agents in connection with the gun deal. They may readily give us this information; However, we should go to the extent of threatening to cancel our contracts if they do not part with this information."

"M/s Bofors have invested vast amounts, marshalled, a large workforce and commissioned a number of sub-contractors to execute one contract. A threat to councel the contract will hurt them enough to make them understand the inescapable requirement to part with complete information."

"If the threat does not work, and in the worst case leads to the concellation of the contract, I believe that the delay in procurement of 155 mm guns would perhaps be about 18 months to 2 years. I believe that we could live with this delay and take a calculated risk. Negotiations will have to be re-opened soonest with France and the UK, so that we can get a near matching weapon system to fill the large void in vital artillery support to our field formations. If we negotiate with both France and the UK, the former will not be able to hike up their prices."

"In Sum, I recommend that in the interest of vindicating National Honour we apply full pressure on Bofors to part with the information needed for legal action against the culprits and accept the risk that this might in the worst case lead to a cancellation of the contract."

The first and only significant disclosures by Bofors were made in their discussions with the officers of the Government of India in September, 1987. It then came out that an amount in excess of 319 million kroners, corresponding to Rs. 64 crores at the then prevailing rate of exchange, had been paid by Bofors to three companies, namely, Svenska, AE Services and Pitco-Moresco-Moineao. Even though the record of discussion stands already published in the various newspapers, it would be useful to take note of certain facts contained in the records. While giving details, Bofors admitted that in the case of the Moresco the payments were made into code-named accounts viz. that of Lotus. They have also admitted that except for Moresco, the payments were made through normal banking channels. It is interesting that payments to Moresco were not made through banking channels. *Prima facie*, this is strong evidence to indicate the clandestine nature of these irregular payments.

Certain definite conclusions emerge from the facts recapitulated by me on the basis of the record. In brief, these are:

One, that Bofors committed a violation of the Contract and a breach of solemn assurances not to use agents or middlemen in connection with the Indian contract. This conclusion has been clearly recorded in June '87 by the Defence Secretary, by Shri Arun Singh, Minister of State, and by the Defence Minister. Shri K.C. Pant. It was also the opinion given by the Attorney General for India on 4th July, 1987.

Two, It was also established that Bofors had paid large sums of money relating to the Indian contract and had entered into an agreement with one company, namely, AS Services, in November, 1985, well after they were clearly informed of Government of India policy in May, 1985. It is of course obvious that they did not agree

to divulge this information to the Govt. of India despite repeated requests.

Three, Legal opinion is available on record, holding that the company's conduct amounted to an actionable wrong and that the Government were entitled to know the names of the receipients and to recover the amounts.

It is established on record that the officers and Ministers concerned at that time were all of the view that action should be taken against Bofors on these grounds. This was supported by legal opinion. In fact, the Attorney General also mentioned in his opinion that if Bofors plea of secracy were tenable then, and I quote, "they can violate the condition precedent insisted upon by the Government of India and agreed to by them to the effect that there should be no middlemen. They can with impunity enter into a contract with a middleman and on the pretext of secrecy can refuse to divulge particulars. This cannot be the true position..."

In other words, the condition itself becomes futile if they are allowed with impunity to avoid disclosing the details.

The decision of the present Government to debar Bofors from future contracts is a natural consequence of the facts established and the views available on the records of the Defence Ministry.

As regards the existing contracts it is important to recognise that the situation prevailing in 1987 was one in which a cancellation, or the threat of cancellation, would have been very effective. In mid-1987, the fulfilment of the Contract was still in the initial stages and its cancellation, therefore, would have meant a real and significant loss of business to the supplier. Moreover, the consequent loss of employment may well have caused serious concern not merely to Bofors but also in other quarters. Of the two contracts, namely, the supply Contract and the Licence Agreement for Licence Production in India, the Supply Contract stands nearly fulfilled and the Company has already received the bulk of the payment due to them.

The preparatory work for the implementation of the Licence Agreement is near the stage of finalisation, but its implementation has not commenced. We have now to review all relevant aspects pertaining to these contracts.

The enquiries conducted so far have failed to inspire public confidence. Only a preliminary enquiry has been instituted by the CBI as late as in November, 1988 and that too for tax evasion and concealment of income. The public Prosecutor of Stockholm in Sweden had started enquiries in this case and had made a request for assistance through Interpol in September, 87. This request was considered in a meeting held on 1st October, 1987, taken by the Home Minister, and attended by the Minister of State, Shri Chidambaram, Special Secretary (A) of PMO and Defence Secretary, and it was decided to divert this request to JPC. It seems that no response was made and no cooperation was extended to the Public Prosecutor in Stockholm, Sweden.

As regards the exercise undertaken by the JPC in which the Opposition parties declined to participate it is too well-known for me to repeat it again here. Considerable time has elapsed since the allegation first made in April 87 and those involved in the case have had plenty of time and opportunity to cover the tracks and build up their alibis. This is a situation which we have inherited.

Our first step has been to expeditiously review, the relevant records and to reassess the existing position with a view to re-vitalising the investigative effort necessary in this case. We have also issued orders to debar Bofors from future contracts, as I said earlier, thereby putting the Company on notice that we mean business.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

the resolve of this Government to enforce the law, recover the amounts paid and ascertain the identity of the recipients. There is no compromise on this. For if no action is taken on default of such a contract condition, parties to future contracts would not be deterred from violating such conditions in the future. We have instructed the investigative agencies to pursue their inquiries and investigations as per law. At the Government level, the review of the whole case is under-way and very soon the matter is going to be taken up with the foreign Governments through diplomatic channels and with the Swiss authorities in terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between India and Switzerland. I would like to assure the House that this matter will be pursued to its logical conclusion keeping the Parliament and the people informed of progress.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, as we have got Half-an-Hour Discussion listed in our today's List of Business, I would request the House that we start the discussion on Half-an-Hour Discussion and at the end of the debate clarifications can be asked on the Prime Minister's statement on Bofors. I have got a lot of names with me.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR (Uttar Pradesh): Before the discussion starts, I would like to submit one thing. Yesterday, he had made a commitment in the Lok Sabha that all papers pertaining to Bofors...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): On a point of order. He cannot refer to the proceedings of the Lok Sabha.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I need not mention Lok Sabha. In Rajya Sabha also he has said so. I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether he is ready to put on the Table of the House entire record pertaining to Bofors as it exists in his possession in the Prime Minister's office. Such a commitment the Prime Minister has made in the Lower House also. I would like to know whether he can place it on the Table of the House so that every Member could get an opportunity to have a copy of the same.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Madam Deputy Chairman, though the reference is to the other House which he should not have made, but as he has made it, one was the commitment to place the notings of the ex-Prime Minister and that commitment has been fulfilled. Then it was about the advice of the Attorney General, that has been done. Then it was about the note that the Chief of Army Staff had sent, that has been done. So, the commitment has been fulfilled, fully as per record. Even that you can see in the Library.

Regarding presenting whole files of Defence on the Table of the House, I think in the process of analysing any defence matter many strategic matters come in and whole files cannot be placed. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU (Tamil Nadu): You gave word.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: The ex-Prime Minister asked me that full notings should be put. His full notings are there. Completely they are there on all relevant documents. However, no commitment on files was made. You can go and see it in the Library. You can read it.

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: You committed in this House, you said it yesterday. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): We would like to know whether the entire files are available in the Library. Why are you not putting these on the Table of the House?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I call upon Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya to initiate the discussion. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: The Prime Minister said very clearly that he is

going to put all the papers on the Table. It is his duty to do so. We must get these. We want to know why he has placed these on the Table of the other House. Are we not entitled to get these papers? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): He is asking us to go the Library and read it ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: Why has the entire record not been disclosed? What is the harm? Why has the Government selected some papers? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: The Prime Minister is insulting the Members. Why should we go to the Library? It is his duty to place it on the Table of the House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: In these papers, we cannot find anything new. There is nothing new in these.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. UPENDRA): What do you want?

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): They should place these papers on the Table of the House.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: इतने मोटे पेपर तो मेरे पास हैं ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI P. UPENDRA: What do they want actually? Files?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, the complete records.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Here it is.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश): पूरे पेपर रखो टेबल पर।... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: यह रांग इन्फारमेशन दे रहे हैं जनता को।... (**व्यवधान**)...:

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: We want Copies.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Can I clarify? What do you want?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): As a person who raised the original Starred Question out of which all this is coming out, I would like to say that the Prime Minister, if he feels that the files are so sensitive that these cannot be made available to the press, could at least do what Mrs. Indira Gandhi did in the Pondicherry licence case made them available in the Chamber of the Chairman so that we can know whether any of his Ministers are involved in the negotiations. This cannot be an excuse. He categorically said all the files at the prompting of the former Prime Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I categorically deny what you say. Go and read in the Library. Files were never said. Go and see the record. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He is backtracking now. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: This is double standard. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are starting a discussion on this matter. The Members can put their demands while they are speaking, asking for clarifications. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: The Prime Minister committed himself yesterday, and now he is running away from his commitment. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The proceedings of the Lok Sabha cannot be quoted here. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Why are you keeping quiet now?

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: Their mouths are shut now. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You are politically finished now. The crimes of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi have come to light. (*Interruptions*).

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY): Madam Deputy Chairman, ...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra):

Kindly be kind enough to listen to me and react thereafter. Thank you very much.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Being so disciplined.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Madam, we do not want a mistaken notion to go that we in any manner want to stall whatever measures you want to adopt to know fully the identity of the recipients. Please do not for a moment think that we on this side are ever interested in impeding your efforts in finding out the identity of the recipients. We would very much want you to go ahead. In fact, the previous Government, our Government sitting there was bound by a promise it made to take the maximum action it could if anyone was found to be recalcitrant.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You concealed the truth.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: If this game is to go on, my people can also play that game, shouting. Mr. Sinha, Kindly listen.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Don't do like this. Wait and listen what I have to say. (*Interruptions*) In humility I am submitting; kindly listen. He has culled out some very important notings from the file. These are as much secret as the rest of the file would be. They are as much in the area of sensitive security as might the rest of the file would be. Therefore, let him not just brush our demand aside like this arbitrarily. We are not very sure as to what is said in the Lok Sabha itself. Did he or did he not promise to lay. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Don't run away. You are running away.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You suppressed all these facts for two and a half years.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Mr. Gopalsamy, I was not in that House. You were not in that house. (*Interruptions*) will you listen to me? (*Interruptions*) Don't you want to listen to me? (*Interruptions*) Did I interrupt any one of you when you were talking? Kindly extend the courtesy of listening to me. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.N. SUKUL: He is seeking information from the Prime Minister, not from you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Mr. Gopalsamy, as I said earlier we are sorry that you lost the election by a narrow margin of one lakh and fifty thousand. If you had gone to that House, you would have very authentically told us what he said. Madam, with great respect we want the Prime Minister to tell us, not just brush aside, but tell us exactly what was the promise that he gave in the other House.

Secondly, apart from what is stated on the floor of this House, if so much information can be culled out, what are the reasons on merits that you are unwilling to put the rest of the file if all this can be brought on a matter which is so sensitive? What is it that is preventing him from bringing the rest of the papers on the Table of the House so that we can also pursue and also find out as to how fair and how equitious has been your approach and how unjust has been our approach or vice-versa? It is from that point of view that I would really want you to react in a very calm, objective and dispassionate manner. That is my request to you.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am on a very small and vital point. I heard carefully the remarks of my hon. friend, Mr Salve. His main argument is that unless all the files—if I am wrong, please correct me—regarding this matter are placed before the House, they will not be satisfied. I think that is the sum and substance of their contention.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: That was your demand also.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: We never asked for files. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, my memory is

not short. I started the whole debate on Bofors in this House when Mr. Venkataraman was the Chairman of this House. He set up certain parameters for me. He called me in his Chamber. He told me "These are all Defence matters." He had set up some limits within which I have to start my debate. I accepted those parameters. Subsequently, debates went on in this House and in the other House for more than two years ...(*Interruptions*)... I am prepared to be corrected. Never we demanded all the files to be placed on the Table of the House ...(*Interruptions*)... Please listen to me.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Bihar): You fought the elections on Bofors. You have to produce all the files. Why do you play this game ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: That is right. What we wanted was all the relevant records, not all the files.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: You shall have to bring all the files ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Now you go back on your word.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Why were you keeping quiet when we were demanding all these records at that time? Why have you concealed them? What were you doing at that time? ...(*Interruptions*)... Please don't provoke us. ...(*Interruptions*)... It was you were suppressing all through ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: I asked you to clarify certain points. Are they irrelevant?

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: Let me complete what I have to say ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Mr. Sinha, I have asked for certain clarifications. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: The Prime Minister has brought all the relevant records.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Bihar): Where are your norms now?

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Which norm did I violate, Mr. Sinha?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: We listened to you patiently for whatever you did say. Now, when the Leader of the House wanted to speak, all your Members start shouting. These are the norms that you want to set.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Mr. Sinha, I was listening to the Leader of the House without any interruption.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: What about others?

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: You cannot guarantee for yourself, what are you talking of others?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: We listened to you, Mr. Salve, whatever you wanted to say.

10.00 P.M.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Now, do you want a meaningful debate? Do you want meaningful proceedings? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I want to ask you here and now, Mr. Salve, and I want to ask all of you, did we disturb the former Prime Minister ever in this House like this? I don't remember that we ever did so in this House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: My crucial question to the Prime Minister was, what did he agree yesterday to lay on the Table of the House?

SHRI P. UPENDRA: I am ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Either the Prime Minister should speak or Mr. Madhu Dandavate should speak because they never lose temper and we are ready to listen to them.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP

SINGH: Let the noise crystalise to a question. Answer to noise is only silence. Answer to a question can be given. (*Interruptions*)... Well, I am already answering a question. My difficulty, Madam, is that I cannot quote the proceedings here perhaps because of privilege. But I can share with you what it was. That was in response to Jaswant Singh's question there whether the Attorney General had given any opinion or not regarding cancellation of Bofors contract. I was responding to that question during President's Address debate and while I was sharing with him as to what the Attorney General had said, the Ex-Prime Minister stood up and said that this is very unfair and I have also made notings, making queries on security and financial aspects and this and that and I said that notings I will place before the House and I have done it. Then, Vasant Satheji also said that this Attorney General's full statement should come and be laid on the Table of the House. I said I will do it tomorrow and I have done it there. I have also done it here. The Attorney General's report has been put in full, not portions from here and there but in full. The Ex-Prime Minister's notings I have read in full. I have not edited them. Arun Singh's notings, I have not edited. It is in full. Sunderji's note, what he has said, has not been edited from here or there. It has been put in full and laid on the Table of the House and also there. So my commitment was regarding these documents and the commitment has been fulfilled. One thing I want to say. If you see this document, it only gives the context that we have taken certain action against Bofors to debar them, to review their present contract. Now, what was the consideration to arrive at such a decision? I had communicated the decision. In this document, we have tried to share as to what were the considerations on which we arrived on this action. I do not know whenever we mention Bofors, they think, they are in the dock. I am only saying as to why ...(*Interruptions*).

श्री सीताराम केसरी: विश्वनाथ जी, इधर से हल्ला नहीं है। आपने इस चीज को शुरू किया है। आपने इस चीज को बढ़ाया है। आपने चुनाव के पूर्व देश के सामने बोला है। इसलिये आपको देखना है। हमारी तरफ से हल्ला नहीं है। इसलिये इस रिपोर्ट को लाईये।

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: This document pertains to the action ...(*Interruptions*)...

Just listen to my answer. (*Interruptions*). You have put so many questions. I had the patience to listen. Then you should have the patience to listen to the answer. These documents are to show that as stated in the House, certain action has been taken. The consideration of that action is in these documents. And we have confined ourselves to those documents. Unless it was insisted, we did not say we would produce the documents. Unless it was insisted, we did not say we would produce the documents. It was insisted. It is only on insistence that we said, "All right, we will produce those notings." This is why I have come out with the notings to support the decision. We have taken action only against Bofors. But, somehow, when we take action against Bofors, they think I have taken action against them. I do not know why this identity is there. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: You kindly take action against Bofors as much as you want. We have nothing against that. We are on the question of documents.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: One more thing I want to ask. (*Interruptions*). Hon. Members on that side ...(*Interruptions*).

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: यह सब गलत है (व्यवधान)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Just hold on. Listen also. Learn like me to listen. Learn from me to listen.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: We cannot learn from you anything. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I want to know. Some of the

hon. Members must have been on the JPC also as members. The JPC was constituted to share all the information. I wonder how the ex-Prime Minister's notings were not produced before the JPC. (*Interruptions*). I want to know how Mr. Arun Singh's notings were not produced before the JPC. (*Interruptions*).

श्री सीताराम केसरी: अब चले जाएंगे आप डॉक में (**व्यवधान**) आना पड़ेगा डॉक में (**व्यवधान**)

डा० रामाकर पाण्डेय: जे०पी०सी० का बॉयकाट क्यों किया (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: And even if they were produced, I do not know, you must be ...(*Interruptions*)... how it is not reflected there. The opinion of Sunderji ...(*Interruptions*)... did they produce it before the JPC? Arun Singh's and the ex-Prime Minister's ...(*Interruptions*). Did they produce the whole opinion of the Attorney-General before the JPC? Did you say it then? Now you want all the details. Why these were not shown then? Why did you not place them before the JPC? It was constituted only for that purpose. You did not show it to them. (*Interruptions*).

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): Madam, may I just make one submission?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I start the half-an-hour discussion? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Madam, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: We must have a discussion. They are running away from the discussion. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mr. Dipen Ghosh.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I had been advised by the Chairman that among others, my notice for a half-an-hour discussion on the reply arising out of Question No. 25 of Mr. Subramanian Swamy had been granted and we would be allowed to discuss this issue today. The time was fixed at 5 o'clock. Then it was being shifted, shifted and shifted. And then, while on the Chair, you had declared that after the Prime Minister makes his statement, this thing will be taken up together and while taking part in this discussion, one Member will be free to or will be entitled to seek clarifications in connection with this statement. So, I am entitled to raise this half-an-hour discussion alongwith certain of my other colleagues on this side and that side. Therefore, I would like to know from you when this half-an-hour discussion will be taken up. This is my point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I had already called and I had already told the Members that we would take up the clarification as well as the half-an-hour discussion together. Since it was listed for 5 o'clock and it was very late in the night and the Members had agreed, I called Mr. Malaviya.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam, I just want to say only one thing ...(*Interruptions*)...

I had requested the Prime Minister ...(*Interruptions*)... I would not take more than a minute ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदया....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Malaviyaji, just a minute. The Leader of the Opposition wants to say something.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am interested in only one thing.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार): मेरा भी एक पाइंट आफ़ आर्डर है..उसी से संबंधित है।

उपसभापति: अभी तो वे बोले नहीं हैं, उसी से संबंधित कहां होगा।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: सुन तो लीजिए । कौन संचिका टेबुल पर रखी जाये या नहीं इस पर दो ही दलों के लोग बोल रहे हैं, बाकी दलों के लोग भी तो सदन के सदस्य है क्या उनको मौका नहीं दिया जायेगा कि कौन पेपर वहां रहे या नहीं रहे।

उपसभापति: आपका नाम है।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: क्लैरीफिकेशन के लिए... सुन लीजिए ... हम आपोजीशन की बात नहीं कह रहे हैं। हम यह कह रहे है कि आप लोग डिसकशन कर रहे है और आपने मांग की है कि सभी संचिकाएं यहां रखी जायें ...(**व्यवधान**) आप अभी मांग कर रहे थे कि नहीं कर रहे थे ...(**व्यवधान**) हमारा यह कहना है कि आप दोनों इस तरह से करके हम लोगों का जो अधिकार है बोलने का हर विषय पर ...(**व्यवधान**) आप उससे हमको वंचित कर रहे हैं। जो इश्यू डिसकस हो रहा है कि संचिकाएं रखी जायें या नहीं उस पर हम लोगों को बोलने का मौका दीजिए नहीं तो हम लोगों को वंचित कर रहे हैं और इसी अधिकार के लिए हमने आपके सामने यह रखा है।

उपसभापति: आपका नाम भी क्लैरीफिकेशन में है। अगर आपको कुछ कहना है तो पहले लीडर आफ द आपोजीशन बोल दें फिर जो कुछ कहना चाहें कहें। पर मेरी मेम्बर्स से खाली यह विनती है नम्रतापूर्वक कि कृपया अभी सवा 10 बजने वाले हैं इस पर डिसकशन होना है उसके बाद दूसरा विषय इक्नामिक्स पर है उस पर करना है और हम लोगों ने आज सदन के सामने यह वादा किया था कि आज की तारीख में खत्म करेंगे 12 बजे के बाद तो कर नहीं सकेंगे, दूसरा दिन लग जायेगा तो कैसे खत्म होगा!

श्री सीताराम केसरी: मैडम, यहां तो दो ही दल हैं पार्टी इन पावर एण्ड इन आपोजीशन, ये तीसरा दल कहां से लाये हैं आप । आप और अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी एक हैं ...(**व्यवधान**) आप आज ही धोखे की बात कह रहे हैं..

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: आप बहुत पुराने मेम्बर हैं।

श्री सीता केसरी: आपने सद्बुद्धि की जो भावना कही वह 30 साल के बाद कही, जब इनसे आपने 4 महीने से दोस्ती की तब आपने सद्बुद्धि देखी, 30 साल तक आपने नहीं देखी।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: आपको मौका दे दिया गया है बोलने के लिए हमको नहीं मिलेगा... छीनना चाहते हैं तो छीन लीजिए।

उपसभापति: आपको मौका मिलेगा।

श्री सीताराम केसरी: हम इनको भारतीय जनता पार्टी को कम्यूनल नहीं कहेंगे इसलिए कि आप उनके पुराने मित्र हैं और आपको हम ...(**व्यवधान**) कम्यूनल मानते हैं, इनको भी मानना पड़ेगा।

उपसभापति: ये बोल लें, हम आपको भी दे देंगे।

श्री पी० शिव शंकर: मैडम, मैं इस वास्ते खामोश रहा कि दो बिहार के भाइयों में पड़ना बड़ा मुश्किल हो जाता है। इस वास्ते मैं जरा खामोश बैठकर सुन रहा था।

Quite a lot of debates have taken place in both the Houses. Every one of us was interested in trying to get at the turth. You may agree or may not agree. You are entitled to say whatever you want to say, but we have not been able to get at the turth. Now, the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister quotes four documents. All these documents, the minute of Shri Arun Singh, then the Prime Minister's minutes, Attorney-General's opinion and also the Army Chief's noting or whatever it is, all these ...(*Interruptions*) please listen to me. I am not creating a problem for you. All these documents relate to June-July 1987. I am not sure whether it is the conclusion of the Government that nothing has been done after June-July 1987; I am not sure about it. But one thing which has slightly upset me is what has been said in the statement, and I quote:

"Considerable time has elapsed since the allegation was first made in April 1987 and those involved in the case have had plenty of time and opportunity to cover the tracks and build up their alibis..." (*Interruptions*)

Just a minute. I am only on the document part of it. I have a feeling it gives the impression that the present Government has already developed cold feet. But what I am interested in this. We would like to know the truth of the matter when we requested for documents, the relevant documents, the relevant files whatever they are. May I make one suggestion? We must get at the truth. Would the Government be pleased to make

these files available to the Chairman? (*Interruptions*) I do not know anything. If I were to know it I would have certainly said it. I do not know anything. I was not a member of the JPC. I never knew it. What I am trying to say is this. Please make it available to the Chairman and whichever you say still are secret you convince him and we would not like to see secret documents. Rest of the notings, etc. which you think are not highly secret will you allow us to see? All the leaders of the Opposition could see particularly about the right to information you have gone to the extent of saying that it is a fundamental right under article 19. I am going to make a suggestion so that we can come to the truth of the matter. And at a later stage you kindly do not get away by saying that time has gone by and therefore there was a sufficient time for the others to cover up the facts. That would only mean that you give the impression that you are not sincere in tracking down the culprits. We would like to get at the truth whatever it is, because I would like to tell you that the entire elections for the last three years your complaint is that there is corruption at the high level. Therefore we are also interested to find out. You may kindly agree to place the files with the Chairman and whichever are secret you show him and if he is satisfied that they are secret they should not be shown to us. We are not interested but we would like to have a track of the notes which are relevant for the purpose of coming to a clear conclusion because this type of statement which refers to 1987 documents is neither fair to you nor fair to us.

That is all I wanted to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is talking only about the papers and he is the last speaker. After that, Mr. Malaviya will speak.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: उप सभापति महोदया, मैं सिर्फ संचिका टेबल पर रखी जाए या नहीं, उसके संबंध में बोलना चाहूंगा। जो अभी विरोधी पक्ष के नेता ने कहा, यह बात सही है कि यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण ...**(व्यवधान)** जरा सुनिए भी तो...**(व्यवधान) सुन लीजिए। हम शुरू करें क्या?**

उपसभापति: हां जी, आप शुरू कीजिए। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: देखिए, यह संचिका टेबल पर रखी जाए या नहीं, इसके दो हिस्से हैं। एक हिस्सा यह है कि जो संचिका या जो जांच के लिए वर्तमान सरकार ने जो लिखा-पढ़ी की है, चाहे वह इंटरपोल को कागज देने के मुत्तलिक हो, चाहे वह वहां की सरकार से सरकारी लेबल पर बोफर्स को बाध्य करने के लिए हो। जो सरकार ने कुछ यहां से नई सरकार ने जो की है एक वह संचिका है, दूसरी संचिका है जो पहले की सरकार के दरम्यान में ...**(व्यवधान)**... सुकुल जी, जरा सुन लेते तो कोई हरजा होता क्या? जो पहले की सरकार का है यह दो तरह की संचिका है। अगर इस सरकार ने जो जांच-पड़ताल की है उस संचिका को रखने के लिए अगर विरोधी दल के नेता कहते हैं तो उसका एक ही उद्देश्य हो सकता है कि कहां-कहां छान-बीन कर रहे हैं उसका पता लगा करके पहले ही काट करें **(व्यवधान)**

श्री पी० शिवशंकर: आपको शोभा नहीं देता। ....**(व्यवधान)** देखिए, आप जैसे सीनियर मैंबर के लिए यह शोभा नहीं देता है। ...**(व्यवधान)** मैंने यह बात नहीं की है। आप जो कर रहे हैं वह बताइये हमको। .... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम आप की ही बात कहेंगे तो .... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री पी० शिव शंकर: आप कह रहे हैं कि मैंने कहा है। .... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम आप ही की बात कहेंगे तो ....**(व्यवधान)**... हम अपनी बात कह रहे हैं।

श्री पी० शिव शंकर: जो बात मैंने नहीं कही है वह आप मेरे मुंह में डाल रहे हैं। मैंने यह बात नहीं कही है, आप मेरे मुंह में यह बात डाल रहे हैं **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: आप हमारी बात, हम अपने चेयर से कह रहे हैं, आपने कहा हमने तो एतराज नहीं किया। हमने फिर कहा ....**(व्यवधान)** जरा सुन तो लीजिए। हम कुछ कह रहे हैं तो उससे क्या है। ....**(व्यवधान)**... आपको पूछ कर करेंगे तो हम आपकी पार्टी में नहीं रहते क्या? हम अपनी बात कर रहे

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

हैं। सुनिए, हम यह बात बूझ गए हैं कि आप लोग अड़े हुए हैं और जब तक और भी आधा सीट खो लीजिएगा लोक सभा में तब तक चैन नहीं होगा। जो हम बूझते हैं, लेकिन हमको कहने तो दीजिए। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री देब प्रसाद राय (पश्चिमी बंगाल): आपको भी हम समझते हैं। ....**(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: आप समझते रहिए, आपको बंगाल तो समझ ही गया है। थोड़ा और समझ लीजिएगा, एक बार और ....**(व्यवधान)**.... हम तो इन लोगों को डिस्टर्ब ही नहीं करते हैं। हम बोलने लगते हैं तो ये लोग बोलने लगते हैं।

उपसभापति आप अपनी बात करिए ताकि कार्यवाही शुरू हो।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम तो जल्द से जल्द खत्म करना चाहते हैं टू द प्वाइंट। संचिका का एक हिस्सा है, जो वर्तमान सरकार जांच-पड़ताल के लिए कर रही है, उसका उद्देश्य एक ही हो सकता है कि उसको जान करके तारपीडो करें और आपका जगह-जगह छान-बीन करके उस एवीडेंस को बर्बाद करें, मैं उस पक्ष में नहीं हूं कि वह संचिका अभी वहां रखी जाए क्योंकि वर्तमान सरकार के ऊपर में जिम्मेदारी है इसको पता लगाना है ....**(व्यवधान)** सुनिए भी तो, आप सुनना नहीं चाहते तो क्या करें। ....**(व्यवधान)** एक बार तो हुआ ....**(व्यवधान)** जहां तक ....**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Why don't you allow others to speak.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Is it the way to conduct the House? *(Interruptions)* I have never disturbed him.

उपसभापति महोदय, लेकिन यह बोलने ही नहीं देते तो हम क्या करें?

उपसभापति: आप संक्षेप में बोल दीजिए।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम तो आप ही को संचिका ....**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति: आप उधर मत देखिएगा।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: संचिका का वह हिस्सा है जो पहले की सरकार के ....**(व्यवधान)** देखिए, उन्हीं की तरफ हम देख रहे हैं।

उपसभापति: मेरी तरफ देखते ही नहीं हैं आप लोग।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: आप ही की तरफ देख रहे हैं। आपको जो नहीं देखेगा इस सदन में उसे फिर आप पूछिए ....**(व्यवधान)**... आप तो अपने आप ही आकर्षित करने वाले हैं इसलिए जरूर ही देखा जाएगा, लेकिन कान भी तो हमको है। हम कान तो नहीं आपको दे देंगे, आंख ही से देखेंगे, ...**(व्यवधान)** कान पर हमला करते हैं।

अभी हम आपसे यह कह रहे थे, जो संचिका पुरानी सरकार की है उसमें से, अब रक्षा मंत्री पुराने जो भूतपूर्व थे वह नहीं हैं, न लोक सभा में और न ही यहां, अगर प्रधानमंत्री जो पहले थे, वह कह दें कि कौन-कौन संचिका का कौन-कौन पेपर, जिसका संबंध है इस कांट्रेक्ट के गोलमाल से, वह बिना देखे हुए दस्तखत कर दिए हैं, तो ....**(व्यवधान)**...

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: हमारे नेता ने जो कुछ कहा है, उस पर बात कीजिए ....**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: इनको मालूम होना चाहिए कि क्या कहने वाली बात है। ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: जो-जो पेपर हैं, भूतपूर्व प्रधानमंत्री या लीडर आफ दी ऑपोजीशन अगर यह बता दें कि पुरानी सरकार ने बिना कागजपत्रों को देखे हुए दस्तखत कर दिए तो मेरी यह राय है कि... **व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: आप कल्पना की बात कर रहे हैं। ....**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम क्या कर रहे हैं, यह तो हम जानते हैं। तो मैं यह चाहता हूं कि यह पेपर लिखकर दे दें कि कौन-कौन से पेपर चाहते हैं, सिर्फ उद्धरण नहीं, पूरा का पूरा चेयरमैन ....**(व्यवधान)**... आप सुनिएगा तो। मेरा यह कहना है, उपसभापति महोदया, कि पेपर कंक्रीटली दें, तो चेयरमैन के पास रखे जाएं और लीडर आफ दी ऑपोजीशन और लीडर आफ दी हाऊस दोनों मिलकर के उन्हें देख लें।

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: क्या यह सरकार कहती है ....**(व्यवधान)**.... क्या इनका कहना यह है कि कागज लेकर भाग गए हैं। ....**(व्यवधान)**....

वित्त मंत्री (प्रो० मधु दण्डवते): कागज लेकर भाग गए नहीं, आपको तकलीफ देंगे यह कागज ....**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम जो कह रहे हैं। **व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति: प्लीज अब आप भी बैठ जाइए ....**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: यह .... बोल रहे हैं। ....**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हमारा यह स्पष्ट कहना है कि कौन-कौन से पेपर वह चाहते हैं, उसकी सूची दें, लीडर आफ दी हाऊस और लीडर आफ दी ऑपोजीशन चेयरमैन के पास देख लें। यही पेपर के मुत्तलिक मुझे कहना है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I' will remove that expression. *(Interruptions)* Now enough. Members, we had enough discussion, and it is tiring for everybody including me. So, I would ask Mr. Satya Prakash Malaviya to go ahead.

श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय: माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Do they want discussion on the Economic Advisory Council Report or...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: We want. We have to discuss it. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, I want to know whether after this discussion, there is going to be discussion on the Economic Report also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: We cannot go beyond 12 o'clock.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, it is listed in today's Business. It should be the wish of the House to decide. I will abide by it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Before 12 o'clock.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I repeat, today's Business. If Members are interested to finish and have that, let them expedite on this issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: "Today's" definition? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam, I just wanted the response of the Prime Minister for the suggestions that I have made. I expected that the Prime Minister will respond to what I have said.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He has already responded. It is listed in the Business ....*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shiv Shanker, when he will reply, I think, he will reply to that. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: The same thing could have been said by the Prime Minister. Or is Mr. Dipen Ghosh the custodian of the House? *(Interruptions)*

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: माननीय उपसभापति जी, मैं 155 एम०एम० हाट्जिर तोपों के सौदे में ए०बी० बोफोर्स द्वारा अदा किए गए कमीशन के संबंध में राज्य सभा में 26 दिसम्बर, 1989 को तारांकित प्रश्न सं० 25 के दिये गये उत्तर से उत्पन्न मुद्दे पर चर्चा आरम्भ करता हूं।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी] पीठासीन हुए]

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, उसी दिन इसी सदन में मेरा भी अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या-149 था जिसके बारे में यह बताया गया था कि मामले की जांच की जा रही है।

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to put the record straight because some controversy has arisen here.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: You will get your chance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Please do not disturb.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब तक बोफोर्स द्वारा दी गयी 319.4 मिलियन स्वीडिश क्रेनर की राशि अदा करने का पता चला है जिसके सम्बंध में माननीय प्रधान मंत्रीजी ने अपने वक्तव्य में अभी काफी विस्तार से बताया है। इस प्रकरण का प्रारंभ 16 अप्रैल, 1987 को हुआ जबकि स्वीडिश रेडियो ने ब्राडकास्ट किया और जिसके सम्बंध में 17 अप्रैल, 1987 को सारे देश के समाचार पत्रों में एक

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

समाचार प्रकाशित हुआ जिसका मैं उद्धरण करना चाहता हूं—

> "Swedish firm bribed "key" Indian leaders". The Swedish State radio said today that the arms firm Bofors won Sweden's biggest export order by paying bribes to senior Indian politicians and key defence figures through secret Swiss bank accounts. Bofors declined to comment on radio allegations that it was planning to pay a total of 100 million krones to members of P.M. Rajiv Gandhi's Congress I party.

उसके बाद पौने तीन वर्ष बीत चुके हैं। राज्य सभा में बराबर चर्चा हुई है, लोकसभा में भी चर्चा हुई है। इसके अलावा इस देश की जनता और जो हमारे राष्ट्र के लोग हैं, वह जानना चाहते हैं कि इस मामले की आखिर सत्यता क्या है? जितने भी राजनीतिज्ञ हैं इस देश में सब को इस देश के लोग शक की निगाह से देखने लगे हैं और उनके मन में यह शक पैदा हो गया है कि शायद इस देश का हर राजनीतिज्ञ भ्रष्ट है। यही नहीं मान्यवर, मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि इस देश के तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री भी शक के घेरे में आ गए और लोकसभा में उनको खड़े होकर अपना वक्तव्य देना पड़ा जिसका उद्धरण करना मैं आवश्यक समझता हूं:

> Intervening in the debate in the Lok Sabha the Prime Minister on 6th August, 1987, the then Prime Minister I mean, during the course of the discussion on the Bofors case said that both inside the House and outside the House many allegations have been made, rumoured and unfounded suspicion has been raised to tarnish the country and its leadership. I categorically declare in this highest forum of India's democracy that neither I, nor any member of my family have received any consideration in these transactions. That is the truth. I have repeatedly said in both Houses that if the inquiries establish that any person has been guilty of receiving illegal payments, strongest action under the law will be taken and then he went on to say, Sir, that the Congress and its Government are as interested as anyone else in finding out the truth. Let all sections of the House cooperate in this common task.

तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री का वक्तव्य 6 अगस्त, 1987 का था लेकिन उसके बाद बराबर इस घोटाले पर पर्दा डालने की कोशिश की गयी। एक झूठ को छुपाने के लिए बार-बार झूठ बोला गया।

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल: क्या झूठ है?

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: उसी झूठ को उजागर करना चाहता हूं। आप सुनिए सुकुल जी। इसीलिए हमारे संविधान में भी लिखा है कि "सत्यमेव जयते"। सत्य की ही आखिर में विजय होती है In the end the truth shall prevail.

इसके पहले कि मैं अपनी बात शुरू करूं, राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे का जो घोषणा पत्र है, जिस राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे की यहां पर सरकार है, उसकी ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल: उसके कितने घोषणा पत्र हैं? आपके कितने घोषणा पत्र हैं?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): There is only one, of the National Front.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: यह राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे का घोषणा-पत्र है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल: आपका कोई घोषणा-पत्र नहीं है।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: यह राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे का घोषणा-पत्र है, यह जो चुनाव हुआ 1989 में, और यह हमारी प्रतिज्ञा है—"राष्ट्रीय मोर्चा राजनीतिज्ञों और निहित स्वार्थों के गठ-जोड़ को तोड़ने और सर्व-व्यापी भ्रष्टाचार को मिटाने का दृढ़ संकल्प करता है। बोफोर्स और अन्य रक्षा सौदों में कमीशन लेने वालों का पता लगाकर, विदेशी बैंकों में जमा धन को देश में वापस लाया जाएगा और दोषियों को दण्डित किया जाएगा।" इसी बात को आपके प्रधान मंत्री ने भी कहा था **(व्यवधान)**

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल: आप भी कह रहे हैं।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: यही मैं भी कह रहा हूं लेकिन हम लोग सत्य पर पर्दा नहीं डाल रहे हैं। इसके बाद आगे चलकर के इसी घोषणा-पत्र में इस बात की चर्चा की गई कि आज भारत में सरकार और प्रकाशन के सर्वोच्च स्तर पर भ्रष्टाचार व्याप्त है और उस भ्रष्टाचार को इस देश की जनता से भंडाफोड़ करने का काम हम करेंगे। उसके बाद चुनाव हुए और ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल: चुनाव के पहले आपने

झूठा प्रचार किया।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: जनता ने अपना फैसला दे दिया है और पिछली लोक सभा के चुनाव में, जिसके माध्यम से 9वीं लोक सभा का गठन हुआ, इस देश ने अपना फैसला दिया और फैसला करके कांग्रेस पार्टी की सरकार को सत्ता से हटाया और राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे की सरकार को दिल्ली में स्थापित किया। यह बात कोई नई नहीं है। मैं अपने नेता चौधरी चरण सिंह का यहां पर उद्धरण देना चाहता हूं जो बराबर कहा करते थे कि अगर किसी देश में राजनीति के भ्रष्टाचार को समाप्त करना है तो ऊपर से जो भ्रष्टाचार है उसे समाप्त करना पड़ेगा और उन्होंने अपने घोषणा-पत्र में कहा—

> "It is at the level of Ministers including the Prime Minister, Chief Ministers and legislators that corruption has first to be stamped out, lock, stock and barrel."

और इसलिए इस देश से भ्रष्टाचार को समाप्त करने के लिए हम आज की जो कांग्रेस पार्टी है, जो विपक्षी नेता हैं—श्री राजीव गांधी—उनका अत्यंत सहयोग चाहते हैं, क्योंकि आपने आश्वासन दिया है कि इस सरकार के साथ हम सहयोग करेंगे। हमारे देश में जो भ्रष्टाचार है उसको समाप्त करने के लिए हम आपसे सहयोग की अपेक्षा करते हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल: झूठ बोलने में सहयोग नहीं करेंगे हम।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अभी अपना जो वक्तव्य दिया है, उसमें इस बात को कहा है और सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी के उत्तर में भी उन्होंने कहा था—

> "The Swiss authorities have been requested on 12.12.1989 to expeditiously furnish certain information."

और यह प्रधान मंत्री जी ने वही बात कही जो कि तत्कालीन मंत्री थे केन्द्र के श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी। जिस मेमोरेण्डम आफ अण्डरस्टेंडिंग की यहां पर चर्चा की गई है और जिस मेमोरेण्डम आफ अण्डरस्टेंडिंग में कहा गया है कि स्विटज़रलैण्ड और भारत के बीच में कोई मेमोरेण्डम आफ अण्डरस्टेंडिंग हुआ है। उस सिलसिले में श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी ने भी इस देश की संसद को और इस देश की लोक सभा को आश्वासन दिया था और उन्होंने इस बात को माना था कि इस देश के बहुत से लोग हैं जो छिपे तरीके से धन इकट्ठा कर रहे हैं और विदेशी बैंकों में, विशेषकर के स्विस बैंक में जमा करने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं इस ओर भी सदन का और विशेषकर अपने मित्र श्री सुकुल जी का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि—

> "The Government are aware that some Indian citizens have clandestine deposits in foreign banks. The origin of these deposits is from various illegal practices such as, invoice manipulation in exports/imports, illegal retention abroad of commissions on exports, illicit trafficking in drugs and smuggling of Indian currency, etc. In order to intensify action against economic offenders, Government has decided to enter into a treaty for mutual assistance in criminal matters with Swiss authorities and pending conclusion of such treaty or agreement, entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with Swiss authorities for assistance in specific cases of Indians having accounts in Swiss banks."

इसी चीज की प्रधान मंत्री जी ने आज अपने वक्तव्य में चर्चा की है और मैं इस बात को बहुत ज्यादा नहीं बढ़ाना चाहता हूं, केवल यह चाहता हूं कि जो सत्य है उसको उजागर होना चाहिए। सत्य पर पर्दा डालने का प्रयास नहीं करना चाहिए वरना इस देश की जनता ऐसे लोगों को कभी माफ नहीं करेगी। इस देश की जनता ने एक मर्तबा सज़ा दी है। अब मैं इस सरकार से आशा करता हूं कि सत्य तो उजागर होगा ही, लेकिन जो दोषी हैं, जो अपराधी हैं, जिन्होंने राष्ट्र के साथ विश्वासघात किया है, जिन्होंने देश की सुरक्षा के साथ विश्वासघात किया है, जिन्होंने रक्षा सौदों में दलाली लेकर इस देश की प्रतिष्ठा को गिराने का काम किया है, सारे विश्व में गिराने का काम किया है, उनके खिलाफ अदालत में मुकदमें दाखिल होने चाहिएं। उनकी पैरवी इस तरह से करनी चाहिए कि ऐसे लोगों को अदालत में ऐसी सज़ा मिले ताकि भविष्य में कोई भी मंत्री, कोई भी प्रधान मंत्री इस तरह की हिम्मत न कर सके। इस देश की जनता क्या चाहती है इसके बारे में हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में जो टिप्पणी प्रकाशित हुई है और श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी के सवाल के पश्चात जो उन्होंने सुझाव दिया है, उस सुझाव को मैं भी देना चाहता हूं।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You cannot quote from newspapers.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: You have been doing so and I can quote from newspaper even the proceedings of this House. Kindly go through the rules of this House. It is said, "Truth must come out." You are also interested, I am also interested, the entire House is interested, entire country is interested.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: But your Prime Minister is not interested. He is not producing all the files. He has promised in Lok Sabha that he will produce them, but he is not producing them.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: This is what the Hindustan Times says:

"Bofors was major issue in the general election and the National Front and other opposition parties made a commitment during the poll campaign that they would go all out to find out who had received the kickbacks. Nothing tangible has emerged till now to establish who exactly were the ultimate beneficiaries of the deal."

(*Interruptions*). Mr. Narayanasamy, bear with me. It further says:

"The task of the new Government is to prove with facts who had made millions by the deal. It is in the national interest that, such a step is taken. What is at stake is public money and property of the decision makers. The public has a right to know how the money was spent and whether it had been diverted to unseemly channels. Bofors has become a by-word for corruption and it is time that the blot was erased."

You should help us in finding out the truth, in erasing the blot of corruption. It is further said:

"Those who are guilty of corruption, whoever they are, should not be allowed to go scot free."

यही मेरी इस सरकार से, इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री से अपील है कि बोफोर्स तोपों की दलाली में जो भी दोषी हैं, जो भी भ्रष्टाचारी हैं, चाहे बड़े से बड़ा आदमी हो, राजनीतिज्ञ हो, पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री हो, पूर्व मंत्री हो, सरकारी अधिकारी हो, जो भी दोषी पाया जाए, उसको सज़ा दिलाने का काम करना चाहिए ताकि भविष्य की पीढ़ियां हमारी इस बात को याद करें कि अगर वे सत्ता में पहुंच कर उसमें भ्रष्टाचार का काम करेंगे तो हमारे लिए दिल्ली की तिहाड़ जेल, इलाहाबाद की नैनी जेल और लखनऊ की जेल होगी।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आशा करता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी सरकार की ओर से जो आश्वासन देंगे उसमें जिन बातों की ओर मैंने ध्यान दिलाया है उनके बारे में आश्वासन देने की कृपा करेंगे और यह बात भी याद रखेंगे कि 'जस्टिस डिलेड इज जस्टिस डिनाइड'। अगर न्याय मिलने में देरी होगी तो देश की जनता चाहेगी कि जो दोषी है, उसका नक्शा, उसकी शक्ल और उसके कारनामे देश की जनता के सामने तुरन्त आने चाहिएं।

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am rising on a point of information. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): I have not permitted you.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am not speaking on this. You just listen to me. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Mr. Subramanian Swamy.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: On a point of information I am rising.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You have to control the House. I cannot.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: You have to listen to me. I am not speaking on the subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Please sit down. Mr. Subramanian Swamy. Then the Minister has to reply.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, you behave as a Chairman... Just listen to this side also, see this side also. I am not speaking on the subject.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No. Shri Malaviya has raised the discussion. The Minister has to reply. And then discussion will follow.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am rising on a point of information. I will be very brief. In fact, after the Prime Minister made a statement here in this House regarding Bofors, about the files I was the first when I asked him, rather requested him and reminded him about the commitment that he had made...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, I want to know whether he is permitted to speak on this discussion.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am again on a point of order. As per procedure, the Minister should reply.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I just seek a clarification from the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): You are repeating the same thing.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Just listen to me. There were many speakers. I was not permitted to speak... I have only two points to make and let the Prime Minister...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is a question of procedure. In half-an-hour discussion, the Minister has to reply first.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: You have allowed me... No, before the Minister replies I want to ask him. Only on a point of information... You just listen. I want information.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): The Minister has to reply.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: There is a Rule Book. Sir, he cannot hold the House to ransom.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Just listen to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): I have not permitted you. No, no clarification.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am not to clarify. He has to clarify. I am seeking information. You have permitted me. I have every right to ask...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Please sit down.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: You have permitted me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): No, no, he has to reply.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Either the Prime Minister feels shy, or he feels embarrassed, or he does not want to keep his own words. That is all I can say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Please sit down.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Just listen to me. Just one point. Just listen, just listen, just listen.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: You please control him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): You are disturbing. Please sit down.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I have a point.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He can make that point after the Minister replies.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I thought Fotedarji is standing to give some information.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Those people who had gone to the well of the House, are talking about the procedure. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I will not defy you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): You are

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]
disturbing. It is not proper. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I just quote Rule 258. It says:

> "Any member may at any time submit a point of order for the decision of the Chairman, ...

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: This is no point of order. Mr. Fotedar did not raise a point of order.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He was asking for an information.

He was holding a *darbar* in the ex-Prime Minister's House.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR:

> "... but in doing so, shall confine himself to stating the point."

> "(2) The Chairman shall decide all points of order which may arise, and his decision shall be final."

Your decision shall be final. There is no objection to it.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Fotedar is on a point of giving an information. He may be permitted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): The Rules say:

> "A Member who has given notice, may make a short statement, and the Minister shall reply shortly. Any Member who has previously intimated to the Chairman, may be permitted to put a question for further elucidation of any matter."

Kindly sit down.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: This is one matter, and that is a different matter. You rule whatever you want.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: He has already ruled.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): I have not permitted you. I am asking the Prime Minister to reply. Please sit down.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: You are not listening to reason, Sir.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, hon. Malaviyaji has raised very valid points. In fact, quite in consonance with the spirit of his suggestions and points, ...

SHRI M.M. JACOB (Kerala): Is it going to be the final reply?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): No. You must know the procedure, Mr. Jacob. You were the Minister earlier. (*Interruptions*) Sit down, Mr. Narayanasamy. Don't interrupt.

SHRI M.M. JACOB: This is an unusual procedure we are following today. A statement and a half-an-hour Discussion have been clubbed together. I thought there must be a new procedure. That is why I asked it.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: About taken action, at least we have taken immediate action of debarring Bofors from future contracts.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: May I ask one thing?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: No. I am not yielding.

And that is the test of the will of this Government precisely. We have not only debarred the Bofors from future contracts unless they come out with the names and return the amount of payment to us, but we are also reviewing the previous Government's going through the existing contracts. So far as the action within our power is concerned, we have taken it immediately. It was precisely this action which is being taken now by the new Government, which was recommended by the Minister of State for Defence, Mr. Arun Singh. He is on record. He has said about this. Whichever side he was, he was on the side of taking ac-

tion. I am on that point. The, Defence Secretary wrote that there had been a breach of contract. He has written. Just a minute.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: That is why we want to see all the files.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It is also in the JPC that he has written.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Let him place on the Table all cases and files pertaining to Bofors in the Prime Minister's Office in response to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. You had made a commitment. Why are you not fulfilling that commitment? That is my question.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Please sit down. The point to be understood is that we have taken this very strong action immediately to put pressure. Apart from pressure we feel that there has been a breach of the assurances that Bofors had given. The Attorney General has in his written advice said that there has been a breach. The Finance Secretary has written to Bofors— It has come in the JPC— that there has been violation of their assurances. Arun Singh has gone on record to say that there has been a breach of the assurance. Then the Defence Minister endorses it. So far there has been no difference between us Shiv Shanker Ji, that Bofors have committed breach. In this we are all one. Do you agree?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have already said.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: All right. Thank you.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: But what is the purpose? You don't give us the document and you don't want us to show. You would like to use only these documents where you are interested. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: (*Interruptions*) Let us agree to some one basic fact. Shiv Shanker Ji has agreed that there has been breach by bofors.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Unless the documents are there I cannot say. Give us the full documents. That is what I said.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Now you have become the pleader of the Bofors. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Don't dance. Mr. Prime Minister this is not the dancing stage. Don't dance. We are asking for the documents. You should be prepared to give.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I knew it. (*Interruptions*) I am prepared to discuss how you come to this conclusion.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): I request the hon. Prime Minister to yield for a moment.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: No. I have done this the whole day and I also have a right...

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: When you sat down, than only Mr. Bhatia stood. We thought you finished and you have sat down. This sort of drama we don't understand.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Let us put it very explicitly as to what is the issue in the debate. Now, Shiv Shanker Ji is not very clear whether Bofors has committed breach or not. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No. Mr. Prime Minister, if you are taking my name, you must give me a chance to speak.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: All right. I give you the chance.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Prime Minister, don't be deceptive. If you are honest, place the entire decuments before the House. Then let us see what exactly is the truth. you cannot just get away like this. Don't do histrionics. (*Interruptions*) This is not the stage of a drama. It is not

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

a question of histrionics. We have got to go deeper into it and come to some conclusions, what exactly is the truth. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Nothing will go on record. Sit down Mr. Jagesh Desai.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Shiv Shanker Ji, I know your delicacy. (*Interruptions*)

11.00 P.M.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Prime Minister, if it is your case by referring to delicacy that I am involved in any manner, I am prepared to quit politics. I am prepared to accept any punishment that this may give... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I was talking of political delicacy... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I come from nothing. I live by my conviction. I care two hoots whoever it may be. But I was only asking about the documents.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: All right. I will not go into the area of delicacy or defence... (*Interruptions*)... I am on the document of the Attorney General appointed by the previous Government and he says "There is a breach of contract." This view was endorsed very categorically by the State Minister of Defence who was running the Defence Ministry. He was virtually the Defence Minister. That is what the Prime Minister said but we do not know.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: By the former Prime Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes... (*Interruptions*)... What does he say: "I recommend he should be told that we should inform both the Swedish Government and the Company that unless they give us the information we want, we will have no alternative but to cancel the contract of FH 77B 155mm Howitzers."

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Prime Minister, what you have quoted of Attorney General, I will read. I will read Attorney General's opinion which you have quoted "If AB Bofors have engaged an Indian agent, it is contrary to the condition precedent to the contract..."

Has it been proved that they have engaged an Indian agent? I am only quoting what he has said. It is all hypothetical opinion. It is totally hypothetical opinion.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Shiv Shanker, his case is hopeless.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: That may be a good case for Bofors. But in our perception when we were clear in our mind that Bofors had committed a breach of contract, we have taken action immediately of debarring them for future contracts unless they come out with the names and return the amount.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Are you sure of the outcome?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, there is one outcome. There will be such a deterrent action that nobody will dare to do it.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: You take it.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: If we allow this to go scotfree our laws of the land will have no meaning to any manufacturer or supplier. This is what Arun Singh has said on the floor of the House "We should not allow Bofors to go scot-free." We want to establish the law of the land to any manufacturer. When we say this is the law, this is the law. Therefore, this law has to be enforced. The point that also has come in this is that Bofors itself has said that Moresco paid under the code name of Lotus and while other payments have been made through normal banking

*Not recorded.

channels. It is not the case with Moresco ...(*Interruptions*)... It is the relevant point which has been taken into consideration. In fact, today this paper is not the consideration that has been gone into for the action that we have taken.

And when we take action against Bofors, I do not know why Shri P. Shiv Shankerji says, it is unfair to them. We are taking action against Bofors ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Nobody said that. Don't dramatise these things. I never said that. Don't be deceptive. Don't tell an untruth.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: So, I take it that you support our action against Bofors.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I would have gone much further. I am only saying with reference to the breach of the contract and other things—I mean what exactly has been done from 1987 onwards, I said, place it before the Chairman and say which are the secret things which we would not like to see, which should not be shown to us. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I only want one answer and a very clear answer. You ask me hundred and one questions. But do you endorse the action against Bofors or not?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Not before seeing the documents.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, that is the point. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Jagesh Desai endorses it but Shrimati Margaret Alva does not endorse it. (*Interruptions*). Mr. M. L. Fotedar stand up and say something. You have been standing up so many times. Do you endorse the action against Bofors? Do you endorse the action of the present Government against Bofors? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Prime Minister, don't lower down the office of the Prime Minister. Don't behave like a child. But what we are feeling is that you have already started developing cold feet. (*Interruption*).

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Do they endorse the action against Bofors? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Sir, may I say something?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): I have not permitted you. So, you cannot speak.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Sir, the Prime Minister is yielding to me. I would like to say something with your permission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Yes, what is that?

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I would like to state the reasons why the record is not coming on the table of the two Houses of Parliament. It is because every single thing which the present Prime Minister is taking credit for has already been initiated by the former Prime Minister ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Just a minute. I would handle all of them. Except threat of cancellation which you have given that your Prime Minister did not do. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, in this statement there is not a single word that this Government, this Prime Minister, has made any threat of cancellation of the contract to Bofors. On the contrary, the statement says that the contract has almost been completed and there is no question of cancellation of this contract. He is again misleading this hon. House. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Whoever speaks without my permission, his speech will not go on record. Whoever speaks with my permission, that alone will go on record.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, I am thankful at least to the Members ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Mr. S.B. Chavan, I have not permitted you. You have to take my permission.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN (Maharashtra): He has yielded, Sir. I am sorry, I have not taken your permission. I requested him and he has yielded. Do I have your permission?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Yes.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: I am sorry. I have not taken your permission. I requested him. He has yielded. May I have your permission?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Yes.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Sir, the point which I would like to make is this. I have not been exactly following the entire thing. But this is what occurred, according to me, and that is why I am asking you this question. Mr. Prime Minister, would you kindly clear whether it is the whole contract that you are trying to cancel or the contract which Bofors might get in future? So, the point will be, you have to presume that Bofors are going to get a contract ...(*Interruptions*)... No. No. He is saying that the question of the already existing contract does not arise. In future contracts, there may be a number of bidders and we have to presume that Bofors are going to get the contract and then you would like to cancel the same. Is my interpretation correct?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Well then, they did none of the things. We have immediately taken action. (*Interruptions*) I am very happy that the action which we have taken has been endorsed, nor by the front row, but by the rest of the rows. (*Interruptions*). It is blacklisting ...(*Interruptions*)... Chavanji had been Finance Minister. He knows the impact of disqualification or debarment. He knows the impact of debarment. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Is it the existing contract or the future contract? What is it?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: So, in a way, I thank this endorsement by the Members on the benches of Opposition of the action taken against Bofors.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY:

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Mr. Pandey, I have not permitted you. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: We have produced the full documents on which relies our decision to take action against Bofors. The documents ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): If anybody speaks without my permission it will not go on record.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: *

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: *

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: *

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: But there was a forum earlier, the JPC. When you were in possession of these documents, did you put them before the JPC, these very documents? Why did you not put them before the JPC, then? You did not boycott. You had the papers. You had these very documents which I have laid on the Table of the House. Why were they not produced before the JPC? You have to answer that before you put any question. (*Interruptions*).

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: *

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I assure. ...(*Interruptions*)... that we will take fullest action and we will be strong and firm on this and there

*Not recorded.

is no compromise on this, whatever they may say.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have been watching this one-upmanship engaged in and indulged in by the Prime Minister on this Bofors issue. The fact of the matter is that the major newspapers of the country are already writing editorials expressing concern at the feet-dragging by this Government on Bofors. Now, what should be done is something I would like to say in a moment. But indeed, from the statement just read out by the Prime Minister, it is quite clear that he has already decided to back-track on two of his most important promises. One is, and it is in almost explicit words, that he thought that it is now too far gone to cancel the existing contracts. I do not know why it is too far gone to cancel the existing contract. In fact, if he was really serious in blacklisting Bofors, he should cancel the existing contract, no matter what the consequences would be.

But he is talking about future contracts which Bofors may bid for and on that he says that unless they give the names, they would be debarred from future contracts. Of course, Bofors has taken it very lightly and the "Times of India" has quoted an Associated Press release saying that they do not think that is very serious and, in fact, they say, "The Indian Government has not been in touch with us and so, we cannot even comment on this.", and they are saying that they had not received any information directly from the Indian Government. I would, therefore, like to know when he decided to debar Bofors from future contracts. Even this simple, small thing, when did he decide? When my question came on the floor of the House ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Oh, ho!

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: No 'ho, ho' now. This is a serious matter and, in fact, there is a suspicion in the country that one of the Cabinet Ministers, one of the present Cabinet Ministers, is involved. I won't come to that question just now. But there will be occasions in future. Of course, Bofors is not going to die away. If it has unseated one Government, the same Bofors may unseat another Government also ...(*Interruptions*)... There is no question about it. It was an important campaign issue and there is no doubt about it. They feel that the accusers are almost among the accused now and that is why they are flinching. I say this because you were able to mount through the Press a campaign that you are absolutely lily-white while they are guilty when, in fact, it is not so.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: They were 'Lotus'-white!

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: But you may be some other kind of white, you may be 'Vishwanath-white', and what kind of white I will explain when we go into it later ...(*Interruptions*)... Now, on that it is quite clear that with regard to the existing contracts he proposes to do nothing which means that it has really warmed the hearts of Bofors! If they can say, if the Prime Minister can point his finger and ask, "Are you ready to agree with this decision that we have taken?", I would like to know whether Bofors would not be happy if they hear that the existing contract is not going to be touched. So, this is an important aspect.

The second aspect comes when he says that it is not possible to find out the names, which is another admission that they are not going to come up with the names. That is why I want to see the files, because I do not know which of them had access to how many files. But the fact of the matter is that from whatever little knowledge I have, I am sure it will be very easy to identify who the principals are who are involved in this. In fact, I would ask whether the Prime Minister would be very good enough to

[Shri Subramanian Swamy]
tell me, to tell this House, which of his present Ministers were in Paris and Stockholm in 1985 and 1986. If he can give me this information—because they travel on official expense and the records must be maintained—if he can a just give me the list and tell me which of his present Cabinet Ministers were in Paris and Stockholm, I would be able to build up a better case the next time when this debate comes up and, indeed, he will not give us. I know it and he is not going to give us the files because I know it for a fact that the files will establish that one of his colleagues has been throughout in the negotiations for the commission arrangement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame, shame ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It seems only one among them is shameful and others are not

SHRI K.V. THANGKABALU: In fact, you should be ashamed ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Sitting here and saying that someone is shameful is not good. In fact, you should be equally concerned about finding it out. And, you see, the commission is not small. It is twenty per cent and it is Rs. 340 crores! Therefore, it is not a question of cleverness. What the country wants, what the country wants from the Prime Minister, is that since he has not been able to stick to his 15-day deadline, since he cannot live by or keep up his party spokesman's statement in a Press conference that after the Government comes to power, if Bofors does not give them the names, they would severe our diplomatic relations with Sweden and do many more things, he should tell the House by what date he would do it. Now he has not been able to stick to all those things. So, he should tell this House and the people of this country through this House as to by what date he will do it. If he cannot do it within fifteen days or twenty days, can he say that he will do it in three months? Can he say he will give us the names in six months or even nine months? Many people will be born by that time. By 9 months you must know that you have been a father. And, therefore, I would like him to categorically tell this House that by such and such time it will be done. He can take all the time he wants. And if he wants my investigative ability to be placed at his disposal, I would be ready. But then that also might get him into trouble, because last time people like Mr. Dandavate and others entrusted me with a job—well, the investigative job was telephone tapping in Karnataka (*Interruptions*). And you are very sorry since then. (*Interruptions*) It was a Parliamentary Board decision. You were a member there. So I would like to know from this Government, the Prime Minister, whether it is a fact which I have read in foreign newspapers that Bofors had already reached a deal with the previous Government to make amends for Rs. 64 crores that seems to have gone to Svenska, and so on and, if so, when that agreement was reached. And what was the actual agreement. I have seen that they are talking about giving the money back. I want to know whether Bofors have already made some arrangement by way of returning the money. And if so, I would say that it was a very serious breach, I would say a breach of privilege on the part of the Prime Minister, to withhold this information from this House. That information is important for another reason which I will go into in the next debate, not now. I would like to know from him whether in the paper he used to read very regularly, The Hindu, and Chitra Subramanian's column—and she is not a relative of mine even though she has the name 'Subramanian'—he has seen her comment where she has quoted the Swiss officials saying that they are surprised why this Government has still not asked for freezing the Lotus and Svenska accounts. In fact the speed with which you could do it is brought out by Swiss block's Noriega's accounts—a sim-

ple application made by the US Government to Switzerland asking that Noriega has accounts in Switzerland. They did not even identify which accounts. In the Svenska's case they can identify the account. In the Lotus case they can identify the account. But in this case they did not identify the accounts. They told the Swiss Government that Noriega has got the accounts. They told the Swiss Government: please freeze them. And the Swiss Government immediately acted. Why have you not done this in this case? I want to know. Is it because the withdrawals from the Svenska's account might again embarrass them? People near and dear to them might be maintaining them. I do not know. The day he became the Prime Minister he should have shot off a letter to the Swiss Government. That is not contained here. Only a Memorandum of Understanding. That is not enough. About Memorandum of Understanding we heard from Mr. Chidambaram all the time. They are talking in the same language now and they are holding the other side responsible. I want to know why he didn't do it. Why didn't he write to the Swiss Government immediately saying that Svenska's account is a bribe account, that was part of cheating and we want it frozen and later on we will send the FIR to get the details? (*Time bell rings*).

I would, therefore, like to conclude by saying, Mr. Prime Minister: do not take the people for granted. For all this clever one-upmanship, putting the other side in the wrong, the people have already given them the punishment in the form that they have removed them from Government; they did not give them the majority. Now you are on test. They are not on test. You said you will get the names. You please take concrete steps and give this House the assurance that by such and such date you will do it. And if you do not do that, it will be assumed that you have something to cover up, that people amongst you have taken the money and that is why you are unable to do it. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am delighted to hear my elderly colleague, Mr. Shiv Shanker, the Leader of the Opposition, that they are very much interested to get at the truth, and for that they wanted all the files to be laid on the Table of the House.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya) in the Chair]

But I pity them because for making this demand they had to pay a heavy price and had to go from this side to that side. We were on the other side and had been demanding various informations about the deal—not to speak of laying of all files on the Table, but informations given to the Joint Parliamentary Committee and certain other informations. We were denied such information at that time.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You wanted all the relevant files.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: All right, I am coming to that point. Just listen. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very much honest and rather more honest than they. If anybody questions my honesty, then I can prove my honesty, not like the previous Prime Minister who said that he or his wife or his children did not receive any kickbacks. What I wanted to say is that it is good that Mr. Shiv Shanker, Mr. Salve and Mr. Chavan, all senior leaders, have asked for more information and all files to be laid on the Table. They should appreciate one thing at least. They should appreciate Mr. V.P. Singh's gesture because the right to information has been granted by V.P. Singh's Government and not by Rajiv Gandhi. (*Interruptions*) Listen to me. If you were on this side and if Mr. V.P. Singh would not have been the Prime Minister, even these informations would have been forthcoming and you would not have demanded all the files to be laid on the Table. Naturally...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You are talking about the right to information. Why are not placing all the files? While participating in the discussion on

[Shri V. Narayanasamy]
Bofors, he had demanded all the files. I am also demanding all the files.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am glad that after the people gave their mandate against the previous Government and installed a new Government headed by Mr. V.P. Singh, we have been given some more information which we were denied by the previous Government. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, from the Statement made by Mr. V.P. Singh, the Prime Minister and also the Defence Minister of the country at the moment, I find that some notes have been given by Mr. Arun Singh, the then Minister of State for Defence, to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the then Prime Minister, by the then Attorney-General of India and by the then Chief of Army Staff. I was going through this book. This report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee to inquire into the Bofors contract was presented to the Lok Sabha on 26th April, 1988. It was also laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on 26th April, 1988.

Many documents have been quoted. Even some opinions, purported opinions of the Attorney-General of India have also been given here. And, I know, there is more information which you want to know. But whatever has been given here in this statement, I do not find that in this Committee Report. Some of the learned Members now sitting on that side were in this Committee. I am not quoting their names. It is written here. I want to know from the present Prime Minister as to what were the files and what was the information that the then JPC had asked the Government to share with because this is a very important question and that was a Parliamentary Committee. And we were told that for the first time in the history this type of a Joint Parliamentary Committee was set up to get at the truth. So, I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister: Is it that all the files which the JPC wanted were shown to the JPC or was it that only the files which the Ministry of Defence or the then Government of India had thought fit to disclose to the Joint Parliamentary Committee were shown? This is my specific question...

AN HON. MEMBER: Convenient files.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: ...because, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, from this Report I find the opinion of the Attorney-General of India, certain opinions given by the Attorney-General of India on 15th February, 1988 and on 8th April, 1988. But here I find the opinion of the Attorney-General given in June, 1987. So, my question is: Was it that even the Attorney-General of India was made to make a statement before the JPC which was convenient to the previous Government and the opinion which was given by the Attorney-General in June, 1987 was suppressed from the JPC?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Was there a different Government in 1987 and 1988? It was the same Government.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: That is what I am asking...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Rather the Prime Minister should have brought to the House the evidence of the Attorney-General and the Army Chief given before the J.P.C.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I found one file note given by the then Prime Minister...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Dipen, would you yield for half a minute? Sir, our problem is this basically: He said whether you stand by the action which the Government has taken or not. That was the question he flaunted on our face. Now the point is whether his own decision is based only on the documents which he has referred to here or an evaluation of the totality of the relevant papers has gone into his judgment. Is that not a relevant factor? If it is only on this, then it is difficult for us to say one way or the other.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You will get

time to put the question to the Prime Minister.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: No, no. It is relevant to what you are saying. Be fair.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Anyway, here we have been given excerpts from a file note of the then Prime Minister dated 15th June, 1987. It is reported that the Prime Minister had taken a meeting on July 4, 1987, after he came back from Moscow. When he came to know that the then Minister of State for Defence, Arun Singh, and the then Chief of Army Staff, had already come to certain conclusions, that they would put pressure on the Bofors to disclose the names under the threat of cancellation of the contract...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: The opinion of the Attorney-General is of the 4th July.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is reported that the Prime Minister had taken a meeting on the 4th July, 1987, after he came back from Moscow. And it was revealed by the then Chief of Army Staff in his interview to a certain news magazine, that it was the then Prime Minister who had put his foot down on the decision of the Chief of Army Staff, on the decision of the Minister of State for Defence, etc. etc. for putting pressure on the Bofors under threat of cancellation of contract to disclose the name of the recipients. So, will the Prime Minister kindly share with us what exactly the previous Prime Minister's decision was that was conveyed in this regard and what were the reasons he had put forth for this. My third question is that when the Swedish National Audit Bureau's report had been sent to the Government of India and the previous Government had shared with us the copy of that report, why a portion of that report had been excised, wherein it was reported afterwards that the National Audit Bureau had already disclosed the fact that commission was paid and the names of the recipients were also given. But it was afterwards made public in the newspapers. Then again, the meeting which the then officials of the Government of India in the Ministry of Defence had taken with the representatives of the Bofors when they visited India, they had agreed to in that meeting—the minutes of that meeting were also published afterwards in certain newspapers—and those minutes have revealed that the then officials of the Government of India, including the Secretary of the Ministry of Defence, had agreed with the representatives of the Bofors to keep the information which they had parted with, withheld from the Parliament of India. At that time when we reffered to this question, we wanted information from the Government of India, while we were on the other side and Mr. Shiv Shanker was on this side.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Dipen, look to the clock.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: And they told us that this was a figment of imagination.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Please put the question.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, it has been *inter alia* referred to here at page 10 of your statement this Pitco-Moresco-Moinea, that even though the record of discussion stands already published in various newspapers, I want to know whether the record of discussion which was published in certain newspapers as reported in your statement, whether it did tally with the records which you are in possession of. Whether the newspaper reports confirm that actually because that will disclose, Mr. Vice-Chairman, how the previous Government had even entered into an agreement with the foreign company selling arms to our country, violating the contract that they would not disclose certain information which that foreign company had shared

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]
with them, even to Parliament. I am saying this because it was Mr. Shiv Shanker...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. Ghosh, please conclude. There are twelve more speakers. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am concluding. It was stated in paragraph 12 of the record of discussion 'It was requested that the information to be furnished in respect of paragraph 11, 1 to 6, be kept confidential'. This is very important, Mr. Shiv Shanker. Mr. Fotedar also should note. Bofors requested the then Government to keep the information, furnished to the Government of India by them, confidential. (*Interruptions*) Confidential, not only from Parliament but from the people as well. Having obliged that foreign company then, the representatives of the Government, the representatives of that party, now have the cheeks to ask the Government to lay on the Table of the House all the files so that they can inspect them. (*Time bell rings*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. Ghosh, you will have to conclude now.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am just concluding. Mr. Shiv Shanker said, I believe, in all sincerity, that he wants to get at the truth. He said that he wants to look into all the papers. But, perhaps, he has overlooked the fact that when he was a member of the previous Cabinet, his Cabinet had agreed, his Government had agreed, to keep even that part of the information, which was given by Bofors to the Government of India confidential, to withhold it from Parliament. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Nobody showed it to him.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He knows.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: He has not seen.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He has not seen? Okay.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It is not necessary that a Cabinet Minister knows everything

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, in the last Session, on the last day, on the penultimate day, myself and Mr. Gurupadaswami raised this question. (*Interruptions*) We were shown neither the files nor the record of the discussion which was published in the newspapers. But we were told that whatever have been published in the newspapers were all false.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: The Prime Minister at that time never...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am not going to yield.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I will help you in your arguments.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. Fotedar, he is not yielding. Please take your seat.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether he would lay on the Table of the House...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: All the files.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: ...the secret record of the talks between the Government and the Bofors which was published in certain newspapers on October 13, 1989, so that we, the Members of Parliament, can know how they had, the previous Government had, entered into an agreement with a foreign company selling arms to our country, that the Government would keep certain information confidential and withhold it from Parliament and from the nation, from the public. I think, Mr. Shiv Shanker would not oppose my idea because, he wants all the files to be laid on the Table of the House. If not all the files, I want the Government to lay on the Table of the House at least the secret record of the talks between the then Government and the Bofors.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: You tell them what files they should produce and what files they should not produce!

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: This is my request. I want this. (*Interruptions*) You want all. I want more, so that it would prove how hypocritic you are and what a hypocritical statement Mr. Shiv Shanker made just now, that in order to get at the truth they want all the files to be laid on the Table of the House. Hypocrites *par excellence*. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Shiv Shanker, sitting in a glass-house, do not try to throw stones at others. Do not throw stones upwards. Individually you may be lily white, but your Government was 'Lotus Government'. In Sanskrit the meaning of the word 'lotus' is 'rajiv'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): You have taken about 20 minutes. Yes, Mr. Ram Jethmalani.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Karnataka): Sir, since all sides are agreed that truth must not only be discovered but discovered speedily, I do not see why there should be so much of acrimony, so much of bitterness and so much of interruptions of reasoned speeches. It is not a matter without significance that the only speech which has been listened to without interruption has been the speech of my good friend, Mr. Subramanian Swamy. He deserves to be thanked for providing this opportunity to the Government to produce evidence which is of a highly condemnable character, but I regret that the impact and significance of that evidence has not yet been appreciated by all Members of this House. Mr. Swamy's intention, of course, was to cast some kind of a vague cloud of aspersion on some undisclosed member of the Cabinet. While he is welcome and I welcome his bravery, I welcome his bravery that he is willing to attack a member of the Cabinet. (*Interruptions*). Will you stop this gentleman from interrupting everybody's proceedings? Every five minutes this gentleman gets up and...

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: महोदय, जब भी सदन में वाद-विवाद हुआ तो किसी ने फिजिकल एटैक नहीं किया ...(**व्यवधान**)।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय): आप बैठ जाइये।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: *

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय): डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय जो कुछ बोल रहे हैं वह रिकार्ड पर नहीं जाएगा।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: While the membership of this House confers complete freedom of speech on Members and provides complete immunity from any legal action for anything said on the floor of this House, that immunity, I respectfully submit, should not become an occasion, justification, or cover for making irresponsible statements.

Sir, I do accuse Mr. Swamy of adopting the attitude of being willing to wound but afraid to strike. He makes insinuations against an undisclosed member of the Cabinet without naming him with a view that some kind of a suspicion might stick to everybody and people must draw their own wild calculations and inferences about what Mr. Swamy meant. If Mr. Swamy wishes to implicate anybody, I expect from him the moral courage to get up and say, this is the member of the Cabinet on whom he is pointing his finger. Otherwise this kind of conduct is totally unacceptable and must be avoided, if not condemned.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: If the Government agrees to a Parliamentary Committee and places all the files before it, I will establish who that Cabinet Minister is without fail.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, the discussion today has got involved with the question of production of files. Now,

*Not recorded.

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]
Sir, I wish to devote a very short time to this question of production of files which has been insisted upon from many sections of the House. I must say that our Prime Minister has publicly pledged his Government to conduct all its affairs in the full glare of publicity and he has promised to the nation full information about the working of the Government. Speaking for myself, If therefore regard the Official Secrets Act, the hated colonial statute, as partially repealed for all practical purposes and our Government, I suggest,, will not withhold any document on the ground that it amounts to an official secret.

SHRI M.M. JACOB: Please tell this to him.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: But, Sir..... Do you understand what I am saying? You don't and you are incapable of understanding these thing- .....Sir, the right to know, to which we pledge, cannot be wider than the right to know which exists under the law of those countries in which there is an express legislation like the Freedom of Information Act. Even in those countries, the courts have unanimously resolved that where there is a pending investigation into a criminal offence, relevant papers must never be produced even under the Freedom of Information Act and will not have to be produced.

SHRI M.M. JACOB: Which is that model country?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, he has made a statement which is legally unsustainable, which has been rejected even by the Supreme Court.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): You will get your chance. Your name is there.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I do not learn my law from Lords like Mr. Madan, or whatever his name is.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: From which lawyer do you learn your law?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I learn my law myself, I learn it from the great judges and I learn it from great judgements, but not from this gentleman.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I do not mislearn the law from the hon. Member.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Everybody knows your stature in the profession.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Everybody knows whom you have been representing in the profession and making money and that is the only field of law that you know—the field of law relating to smugglers—and here you try to pose yourself as a jurist.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I made it three years ago very clear on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other House as well when I was a Member of the Lok Sabha that I have appeared for a large number of smugglers and at the same time I have appeared for a large number of Congressmen. I am willing to identify some of my clients sitting on the opposite side.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Now you have the moral courage to name them. You asked me to have the moral courage. Now you have the moral courage to name them.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I want challenge from them, not from you.

Now, Sir, therefore, if these files' contents leak out to the potential accused who are going to be investigated, they will be in a position to tailor their defence according to the contents of those files and I think the Government will be committing a gross dereliction of duty if it allows its files to be disclosed while the criminal investigations are pending. (*Interruptions*) There was a proposal made.....I am not yielding to

anybody. There was a proposal made. Kindly stop him. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, what has been put forth ....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): You are speaking without my permission, Mr. Bhatia.

SHRI ISH DUTT YADAV (Uttar Pradesh): Nothing should go on record, Sir.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I am on a point of order. It often happens that Members do interrupt and do make interjections, but those things are not taken out of the record. Please don't set that precedent. Do you mean to say that it would be taken away?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): No. Mr. Bhatia's name is also there. He is a participant.

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: आप बहुत बार ऐसा करते हैं। कोई मैम्बर कुछ कहे तो जरूर रिकार्ड पर आना चाहिये। ऐसा न हो कि रिकार्ड पर न आए। मैं मानता हूँ हमें बहुत ज्यादा इंटरप्शन नहीं करना चाहिये मगर कोई मैम्बर कुछ कहे तो रिकार्ड पर जाना चाहिये।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, may I continue? Will you stop this?

Sir, a suggestion was made that the files should be made available for inspection by the distinguished Leader of the Opposition in the hon. Chairman's chamber. Sir, I personally would never have any objection to any distinguished Member of this House inspecting a particular file. But, Sir, if the contents of the files leak out to the potential accused, grave public injustice would have been done. And are the hon. Members on the Opposition Benches in a position to guarantee that no leakage shall take place after the files are shown to anybody in the Chairman's chamber? Sir, I would suggest that this will be a risk not worth taking because ultimately when the files are relied upon in the court, the entire files will have to be produced, and anybody who wants to cross-examine on the basis of those files, will have the fullest opportunity to summon them at the proper time and at the proper stage of those investigations.

The Prime Minister has pledged in the statement which he has made that the investigations shall continue and continue remorsely. Sir, while I thank him for this great assurance that the public of this country wants, I wish to tell him that what he has promised to the nation is merely a reiteration of the constitutional and legal obligation of the state and the Government under the law of the land. There is no power in any Government to stop, thwart or frustrate a pending investigation into a cognizable offence. The prosecutions can be withdrawn after the investigations are completed, the matters have reached the court. There the withdrawals can taken place in exceptional circumstances on the ground of public interest but with judicial consent after a judicial hearing. But, no Government has the right to stop an investigation, and investigations must proceed to their logical conclusion. That is the law of the land, and the Prime Minister has only affirmed the constitutional and legal obligation of the Government under the existing law.

Sir, I shall make it clear that no civilised Government committed to the rule of law can enter into a deal with anyone to suppress truth in return for political support, constructive, critical or issue-based. Whatever be the kind of political support, the Government shall not seek that support as a consider at or quid pro quo for suppressing investigations into the discovery of truth.

Sir, Mr. Swami's apprehension is that the Government may develop cold feet if it comes to light that somebody high-up in the Government itself is involved. I do not speak on behalf of the Government. But certainly I speak as a Member of the party, and certainly as a Member who has at least some marginal influence on the conduct of the Government's course

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]
of action. I can say this for myself that should it ever appear in the evidence that a high-up in this Government, whether he is a former member of the Cabinet or not, is involved in the offence, I shall be the first one to denounce that person in the company of Mr. Subramanian Swamy. He can rest assured that I shall be on the right side of him if such a situation comes to pass. But I know that such a situation will not come to pass.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Please come to questions. You have already taken 13 minutes.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Kindly. I have not spoken in this House ever since we came back. And the whole day you have missed me for 12 hours.

Mr. Swamy has raised two other points which require to be dealt with.

12 MIDNIGHT

Why have you not frozen accounts like Noriega accounts were frozen? Noriega accounts were frozen not by the Government merely writing to the Swiss Bank to freeze them; that there was a Noriega account, you freeze. No. The Swiss authorities under the existing law of international mutual assistance are prepared to help provided there is a First Information Report recorded about an offence under investigation in the requesting country; and that offence is an offence under the Swiss Federal law. Now, that has not been done as the statement of the Prime Minister shows. It is a matter of the greatest fraud which has been committed on the people of this country by the previous Government that till today they have not recorded the First Information Report.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Why have you not acted in the last 26 days? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Please sit down. You don't even understand what I am saying. Recording of the First Information Report and the pendency of an investigation into an offence, which is an offence both under the Indian law as well as the Swiss Law is the condition precedent to any disclosure or any action in Switzerland.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: In the last 30 days this Government could have done it under bribery.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Swamy, kindly hold your horses just for a minute.

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: वी.पी. सिंह नाम बताते क्यों नहीं कि किसको दी गयी है।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: He gets up every time. (*Interruptions*) Will you please control him?

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, एक सूचना मैं चाहता हूं। जब जनता पार्टी के एक नेता के घर पर इन्हें मारा गया था तो इन्होंने क्या कोई रिपोर्ट थाने में दर्ज करायी थी और मुझे ऐसा पता लगा है जिसे ...**(व्यवधान)** मैं जानना चाहता हूं गवर्नमेंट से कि जिस नेता के घर पर ये गये थे उन्होंने इन पर डाकेजनी का केस चलाया है और पुलिस में रिपोर्ट लिखाई है।

श्रीमती सत्या बहिन (उत्तर प्रदेश): मिस्टर जेठमलानी आपकी पिटाई हुई थी तो आपने क्या कोई रिपोर्ट दर्ज करायी थी?

श्री राम जेठमलानी: उस पिटाई को मैं पसंद करता हूं क्योंकि वह शरीफ इन्सान था।

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: कुर्ता फाड़ दिया।

श्री राम जेठमलानी: कोई बात नहीं।

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: आपको विजया चक्रवर्ती जी ने बचाया था।

श्री राम जेठमलानी: आप सारे हिंदुस्तान की लोकशाही का कुर्ता फाड़ रहे हैं।

I would like to know from my Prime Minister whether he has been apprised of three pieces of documentary evidence. One, a letter of 21st of August, 1987 written by the Government of India to the Government of Sweden in which the Government of India had said that they are investigating a case of bribery by public servants, a stand which they subsequently abandoned because they realised

the danger of persisting in that allegation. After that allegation was quietly dropped they started talking of tax-evasion, because they realised that the moment they talked of bribery of public servants, the Swiss authorities will yield information which they were never interested in securing.

Sir, one thing is clear that deliberately and consciously, knowing fully well that the Swiss authorities under their existing law cannot yield any information or assistance, deliberately we have approached the Swiss authorities with a written request which we know will be rejected, we have told them that the Government is investigating a case of tax evasion by Mr. Win Chadha and the Government knew perfectly well that no disclosure is possible on such a request.

Now, the question Mr. Swamy raises is relevant. And that is the question which I myself wish to address to the Prime Minister. Though, Sir, I can almost anticipate the answer of the Prime Minister, I must formaly ask that question: Why is it that till today a regular First Information Report for an offence of bribery by Indian Public Servants on Swiss soil—because the money has been deposited in Swiss Accounts, therefore, in the eye of law the payment of bribery has taken place on the soil of Switzerland; therefore a federal crime under the Federal Law of Switzerland—has not just been recorded? The people of this country are looking forward to expeditious disposal. But while I recognise that voluminous records have to be perused at various stages, the Government is busy with other things. A team of Officers has to be collected for this purpose. I understand all this, but ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: What is holding you up? For 40 days you have done nothing.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Because am too busy in collecting the material. The second piece of documentary evidence is, I hope the Prime Minister has been made aware of it, that on the 26th August, 1987, Mr. Eric Thombon, President of Nobel Industries, the parent company of Bofors, made a statement in which he said "I do not know or care whether the Indian agents paid by Bofors used the money for bribing the Indian officials." Third, the Swedish Public Prosecutor, Mr. Lars Ringberg, when he commenced the investigation at the Swedish end, expressly put it on the ground that he was investigating the case of bribery of foreign public servants. Sir, lastly, Mr. Ringberg wrote to the Swiss banks in September, 1987 and this is the sentence in his letter "There is well-founded reason to believe that an offence of bribery has been committed." Sir, even the swiss believed that an offence of bribery had been committed. Our corrupt Government continued to present that an offence of tax evasion had been committed not by public servants but by some Mr. Win Chadha whom they are keeping in Dubai as an honoured guest to be brought here whenever convenient to be let off. Sir, that is the fraud which has been played on the people of this country. Sir, Mr. Swamy can be assured that investigation will proceed remorselessly against everybody. But I do wish to share with this House a small little anecdote about what happened in the House of Lords in England. In the house of Lords, in England, the Archbishop of Canterbury one day proposed to the British Government that adultery should be made a criminal offence. I believe that it was Lord Strebolgy or somebody who was speaking on behalf of the British Government and he said "The honourable primate does not seem to have considered the implications of his proposal. At least a thousand persons will land in jail and some of them might include the Members of this august House." Sir, I wish to say no more.

श्री देव प्रसाद राय: आप समझ कर हंस रहे हैं कि ऐसे ही हंस रहे हैं?

श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा: आप समझे हैं क्या?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: It was about bribery or adultery?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: My area is both ...(*Interruptions*)... Do not worry about that, I am not a hypocrite. I either defend or prosecute. I hope you know that.

Sir, the Arun Singh note of 11th June which has been prominently mentioned in the Prime Minister's statement acquires a new significance, when some more facts are borne in mind. Sir, 11th of June is the date on which Gen. Sunderji was asked "whether contract could be cancelled without any danger to security." 11th of June is the date on which he reduced his opinion to writing and put the date 12th of June on it and 13th of June is the date on which he handed over this document to the Defence Secretary, Mr. Bhatnagar Sir, this document was found totally inconvenient and that is why an attempt was made, not officially. I can understand if the Prime Minister does not like an opinion which he has received from his Commander-in-Chief. He can write to him: "I think that these are the circumstances you have not taken into account. I think your opinion is wrong. Are you willing to change your opinion?" But this is not what happened. What happened to the matter, which I hope the Prime Minister will take note of and I wish to be assured that it has been taken note of by the Prime Minister is that during this period between 13th of June and sometime in the middle of July an attempt was made by people whose names are on record today and have become public. An attempt was made to persuade General Sunderji to substitute one report by another. Now this is not asking somebody to merely change his opinion in the light of alternate circumstances. (*Interruption*).

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Has General Sunderji said so to Mr. Jethmalani?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Sunderji has said so in India Today. If you do not read, what can I do? I am sure that General Sunderji will be interrogated by the police and his statement will be recorded. (*Interruption*).

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: His statement has been recorded. (*Interruption*).

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, will you ask this gentleman not to disgrace this House?

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: "इंडिया टुडे" में सितम्बर, 1989 को जनरल सुन्दरजी ने कहा है कि एक अच्छी तोप की बदनामी सैनिकों के मन में तोप प्रणाली की क्षमता के संबंध में ....**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय): पाण्डेय जी, कृपया बैठ जाइये। पाण्डेय जी, आप कृपया अपना स्थान ग्रहण करिए। आप बार-बार खड़े हो जाते हैं यह ठीक नहीं है। पांच बार आप खड़े हो चुके हैं, आप कृपया अपना स्थान ग्रहण करिए।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: माननीय सदस्य ने पहले मेरा नाम लिया तब मैं खड़ा हुआ हूं और फैक्च्युअल स्थिति क्या है ...**(व्यवधान)**... आदेश आप दें कि मैं बताऊं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय): आपको कहने का मौका मिलेगा। आप बार-बार खड़े हो जाते हैं यह अच्छा नहीं है। आप कृपया अपना स्थान ग्रहण करिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: उनका तो कोई स्थान ही नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I will not take half a minute more and I have finished. (*Interruption*). The police is going to investigate. If I am distorting anything, the police will look into. Go and tell the police that Mr. Ram Jethmalani has distorted things. (*Interruptions*). Because I have investigated it myself. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Don't bring disrepute to be JPC.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: There are two things which I wish to ask and that is what makes me close my speech. Sir, the first thing is that I hope it is realised that this is going to be a very

sensitive investigation in which all allegations of all kinds will be mentioned by those whose liberties and whose character will be in jeopardy and therefore it is of the highest importance that this investigation must be put in charge of officers of the most impeccable integrity and a clean public record and Sir, I hope that this investigation shall be constantly supervised by the highest law officer of the Government, perhaps, by the Minister incharge or perhaps by the Prime Minjster himself. This alone will ensure that the investigation is being conducted on right lines and under right auspices. Sir, lastly, the question of cancellation of the last existing contract, as distinguished from future contracts. Now, this is the point which Mr. Subramanian Swamy raised. There is great substance in this point and this point requires to be dealt with and Sir, I take half a minute and I have done. Sir, my friend, Shri Subramanian Swamy, for whom I have the greatest respect—I have great respect for his acumen but I do expect the Harvard Professor to know that an executed contract cannot be cancelled. It is only an executory contract which can be cancelled. *(Interruption)*. Please sit down. You don't even follow what I am saying. (*Interruption*).

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: May I also inform him that sometimes he forgets his law. If the agreement is being executed, then they can sue for damages.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: You are talking of cancellation of a contract. You can sue for breach of warranty, you can sue in damages for breach of warranty, for breach of special terms of the contract. (*Interruption*).

Now I come to the last point. That is my last question that the Government will closely examine it. If the Government has examined it, at what stage does the contract stand today? If any part of it is an executory contract which can still be cancelled without loss to the national revenue and without involving serious consequences which are unbearable, then even the existing contract must be forthwith cancelled and that is what I ask the Prime Minister. Thank you, Sir.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक पाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय): जी बोलिए।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: वह यह है कि बिजनेस एडवायजरी कमेटी ने तय किया था कि 29 तारीख तक यह सदन बैठेगा, लेकिन यह 30 शुरू हो गई और आप जिस ढंग से हाऊस में बहस चला रहे हैं, उससे शायद यह साल भी खतम हो जाएगा, अगले साल में होगा। यहां माननीय सदस्य सिर्फ क्लेरीफिकेशन नहीं करते बल्कि भाषण भी किए जा रहे हैं। तो एक तो आप यह तय करवा लीजिए कि अगले साल तक बैठेंगे या 30 तारीख तक बैठेंगे क्योंकि कहा यही गया था कि 29 तारीख तक ही बैठेंगे। इसके लिए आप तय कर दीजिए या फिर हाऊस से तय करवा लीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय): जो 29 तारीख की सिटिंग चल रही थी, वही सिटिंग चल रही है। जो आगे आने वाले लोग इसमें भाग ले रहे हैं, उनसे मेरा अनुरोध है कि कृपया समय का ख्याल रखें, जिससे कि जल्दी से कार्यवाही खतम की जा सके। अब सवा बारह बज चुके हैं और अभी प्रधानमंत्री जी को भी उत्तर देना होगा। श्री पी.एन. सुकुल।

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: What about the list? You have to go according to the list. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. Sukul has made a request. He wants to go. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P.N. SUKUL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is rather unfortunate that the statement of the Prime Minister does not make us any wiser about the matter relating to the payment of commission in the Bofors, gun deal. Sir, it is a very serious matter which involves the integrity and the prestige of two Prime Ministers because the present Prime Minister has openly, in public meetings, condemned and charged the previous Prime Minister of having collected and pocketed the commissions, kickbacks, in the Bofors

[Shri P.N. Sukul]

gun deal. So the integrity of both the Prime Ministers are involved there. And only either of them can be guilty. Both of them cannot be guilty. Now, if it is not proved that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has anything to do with the payment of commission, then, most certainly, the integrity, dignity and prestige of the present Prime Minister will be at stake and he will have to accept it. *(Interruptions)*. The Prime Minister's statement has failed to establish that the previous Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has had anything to do with the payment of commission in the Bofors gun deal. In fact, the new Government and the new Prime Minister do not yet know to whom the kickbacks were paid. They still do not know. The inquiry is on and we do not know to whom the commission was paid and still it is most regrettable, rather deplorable, that the present Prime Minister, his partymen, openly charged the previous Prime Minister of having pocketed the commission. During the elections and before the elections, I was myself in the constituency of the present Prime Minister for a number of days. *(Interruptions)*. I was myself in the constituency of the present Prime Minister for a number of days before the actual polling and everywhere, in the city and in different constituencies, slogans were written on the walls and posters were pasted to the effect that राजीव गांधी चोर है। हम कहते हैं—भारत महान और वह कहते हैं इटली महान, स्विटजरलैण्ड महान।

Such irresponsible posters were pasted and slogans were raised in the constituency of the present Prime Minister and he openly, in Patna and in so many other places, in public meetings, said that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had pocketed the money, that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and his relatives had pocketed the money, whereas Mr. Rajiv Gandhi himself had denied that in the Lok Sabha by saying that he or his relatives had nothing to do with it.

I would, therefore, would like to know from the Prime Minister, first of all, why he and his partymen label the previous Prime Minister as a thief when he still does not know who has taken the commission and why such disinformation is spread about him. I am sure that his prestige as Prime Minister has fallen in my eyes and, I am sure, in the eyes of crores and crores of people, if not of the North, at least of the South. I want to know whether it was just an election gimmick or whether it was a planned attempt to discredit Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Why was this malicious campaign launched at all against a clean and innocent man, the son of the late Mrs. Indira Gandhi? Why was the whole nation made to believe that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was corrupt man whereas he was not? And even today this Government cannot prove that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is a corrupt man. Then why this disinformation was spread?

Now, I come to the point raised by the honourable Member, Shri Ram Jethmalani and I come to the argument of Mr. Ram Jethmalani. He has said that the files cannot be shown even to the Leader of the Opposition in the Chamber of the Chairman. Why? It is because, he says, if this information passes on to the accused, to those who are involved, then it will result in gross injustice. But the files can very well be shown to the Leader of the Opposition or to the Chairman under the oath of secrecy. They can very well be shown under oath of secrecy and he will not pass them on to anybody else.

I now come to my third point, Sir, in this statement, certain extracts have been given of the statements of the Attorney-General and General Sunderji. I want to know from the honourable Prime Minister whether these statements of these two persons and the evidence tendered by them before the Joint Parliamentary Committee tally at all. Do they tally or they do not tally? The evidence that was given before the Joint

Parliamentary Committee was under oath and you have to tally them. There are many contradictions in them. Therefore, these facts are not of much consequence.

Lastly, I would like to know one thing from the Prime Minister. Is it not a fact that recently, before this Government came into power, Bofors had themselves suggested that the amount of Rs. 64 crores, would be adjusted against the future contracts that would be given to Bofors? They were ready to pay back this Rs. 64 crores, but only by way of adjustment in the future contract. Is it a fact or not? Thank you, Sir.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the National Front's manifesto stated that in the Bofors case the truth will be unearthed. Today, those who were in the previous Government are also saying that they are wanting to know the truth!

Sir, there have been three possible sources through which truth could have come out. One is the present Government. The second was the previous Government. And the third was investigative journalism. What is the fact today, Sir? The present Government even within a period of 20 days has come out with a paper which has clearly stated as to what is the direction in which truth could be found out. I know Mr. Swamy is not here, he will take it not as the whole truth. We do claim that it is not the whole truth. But we are moving in the direction of truth. The investigative journalism over the period has been trying to take the country towards the truth with regard to the Bofors gun deal. The previous Government, while it had access to information, while it was in charge of the information that was available from different sources was also not trying to arrive at the truth. For that it had taken the advantage of certain agencies. But those agencies in turn had to work on the information supplied by the Government itself. And one such agency was the Joint Parliamentary Committee. The previous Government told in the House, outside the House and in the other House, on the basis of the conclusions that were arrived at by the Joint Parliamentary Committee that they were not in a position to say this. But today of course the Leader of the Opposition in a broad consensus and also many Members on the other side in a broad consensus did agree that there were kickbacks. There were....

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Why is he putting words in our mouth?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We will have occasion. We will talk about it.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Don't refer to us and say things without basis.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It is what I understood from the broad consensus which arrived because a specific question was put and specific answer came forth from that side also. Therefore, if I say that there has been a broad consensus that there were kickbacks and that those kickbacks had gone to some people, etc. etc., I am not making a wrong statement.

Anyhow, Sir, the previous Government tried to base its conclusions on the basis of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister with regard to four important informations which were made available to the Joint Parliamentary Committee or not. Sir, one is, was it a fact that the JPC had access or had not access through the agency of the then Director of Central Bureau of Investigation that PITCO and MOCESCO did not exist, that on the other hand MONEO S.A. existed, as a result of which, Sir, the conclusions to be arrived at by the JPC were clouded by mystery, and therefore they were unable to specifically come to the conclusion which otherwise, if the information was available to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, even though it was a trunkated Joint Parliamentary Committee, even though there were no Opposition Members, could have come to the conclusion about the truth with regard to the Bofors scandal and the payments. But, unfortu-

[Prof. C. Lakshmanna]

nately, Sir, the then Director of CBI did subsequently say that he misunderstood for something else, so on and so forth. But nonetheless the Committee did not have the benefit of the Director of CBI about the correct assessment with regard to PITCO, MORESCO, SVENSKA and AE services. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not it was a fact that the Joint Parliamentary Committee was constrained for want of this information, the correct information, as a result of which the entire country was kept in darkness. On the 'crutches', to use their own terms, of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, the previous Government deliberately tried to whitewash the entire Bofors scandal and did not allow the truth to come out. The previous Government deliberately tried to whitewash the entire Bofors scandal on the crutches of the Joint Parliamentary Committee and did not want the truth to come out.

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: Point of order, Sir.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: If you are allowing the point of order, then I will sit. Otherwise I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Yes.

श्री मीर्जा ईर्शाद बेग: श्रीमन मेरा प्वांइट आफ आर्डर है। जे०पी०सी० क्रो रेफर करके प्रो० लक्ष्मणा ने जो बात कही मैं समझता हूं कि ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी दोनों ही सदनों का बड़ा ही उच्च फौरम है। इसको जिस ढंग से जिन शब्दों में आप कह रहे हैं, मैं समझता हूं कि यह ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी का अपमान है और यह संसद की प्रणालियों का भी अपमान है। इसकी जो रिपोर्ट है उसको चाहे आप जो भी अर्थ निकालें लेकिन जे०पी०सी० के लिए यह कहना कि इसको फेबरेबल होने के लिए बनाया गया, मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिलकुल गलत है। मैं यह रेकार्ड में लाना चाहता हूं कि जे०पी०सी० पर जिस प्रकार से ऐस्पर्शन लगा रहे हैं, यह बहुत गलत बात है! He must withdraw all these words. It is the highest forum. It is none of our mistake that you did not join the J.P.C.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): I have heard your point of order and I rule it out.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Do you rule that he can say anything about the J.P.C.?

श्री मीर्जा ईर्शाद बेग: आपको कहना चाहिए कि वह जे०पी०सी० के बारे में ऐसी बातें न कहें।

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I did not say anything about the Joint Parliamentary Committee. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Is it a holy cow? Can a Member of Parliament not talk about it inside Parliament?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In the Parliament, there was a debate on the J.P.C. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. Bansal, you address the Chair. You are an able and seasoned parliamentarian.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Right from the first Parliament up to the last Parliament, there have been a number of committees of the Parliament including the last Joint Parliamentary Committee on Bofors on which many debates have taken place and mercilessly the findings of the Committee have been attacked. There has been no bar in the Parliament on criticising the J.P.C. or any other parliamentary committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Please put your questions, Mr. Lakshmanna.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I did not dilate on anything. I have been putting straight questions in the process of eliciting information. I think I will not commit the mistake of going here and there. I shall be directly on the question. Was it a fact or not a fact that the Joint Parliamentary Committee did not have the information that the two companies did exist and if they did exist, a sum of 31.5 million SEK were made available to a particular company which was considered

to be non-existent, into the Lotus account not through normal procedures of banking? Secondly, is it a fact or not a fact that the information that is supposed to have been supplied by Bofors in September, 1987 is that MORESCO S.A. and PITCO were registered companies and that they willingly participated in the entire process? I would like to know whether this information which was available with the Government of India was made avilable to the Joint Parliamentary Committee or not; was this information made available to the Joint Parliamentary Committee to enable it to come to the right conclusions? If it was not made available, does it mean that the previous Government was trying to suppress certain information which legitimately belonged to the Joint Parliamentary Committee for its perusal and investigation? Therefore, I would like to know that from the Prime Minister.

Thirdly, Sir, I would also like to know whether the Joint Parliamentary Committee on whose conclusions the then Government tried to present a picture which is not depicting the truth as it ought to be was having the evidence given by the Attorney-General. The one which was given to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, was it the same as the one which has now been given by the Prime Minister? Is it the one and the same or are they two different things? If it was a different thing, is there any record to show why the information which was given earlier by the Attorney-General was not made available to the Joint Parliamentary Committee to enable it to come to correction conclusions? Sir, this information is very important. After this, Sir, I would like to ask two more questions. Is there any evidence available with the Government of India or even an indication that MORESCO S.A. is having some Italian connection? If so, what are the details with regard to it? Another information, Sir, that I would like to know from the Prime Minister is this: Was there an *aide memoire* sent by the Indian Ambassador to Sweden? If it was there, what did it contain? Was this *aide memoire* also made available to the Joint Parliamentary Committee to enable it to come to correct conclusions?

Finally, Sir, how much information is available with the Government with regard to the four agreements into which the Bofors had entered into, and whether this information was made available by the Bofors officials either when they came here or when there was a discussion between the Government of India officials and the Bofors officials or when we sought the information from the Swedish Government? If so, what are the details with regard to it? Sir, if all this information is available, this will further add to the direction in which the truth lies. There is no doubt, Sir, the country today wants to know the truth, the sooner the better. And that will alone cleanse the public life.

Sir, the Bofors scandal, the Bofors gun deal has put the accusing finger at the high places. And if the accusing finger rests at the high places, it will not have a good impact upon the society as a whole, and the society has to be put on the rails, in the proper direction. There is a need for finding out as to who have been responsible in the high offices for kickbacks as it has been established now in the case of Bofors deal. I, therefore, request the Prime Minister to kindly let us have this information so that we will get a more rounded information about the truth of the Bofors gun deal.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Shri Gopalsamy.

SHRI M.M. JACOB: Sir, before Mr. Gopalsamy speaks, I would like to make a humble submission. In the beginning we were told that you were clubbing the Prime Minister's statement and the Half-an-hour discussion together. And I as Chief Whip of this party had given the names of Members to participate in that.

[Shri M.M. Jacob]

I have seen with my own eyes that it was being written out. Later on the clarification paper started coming and I have seen three or four times the papers being changed and I find that this side of the House is totally ignored practically. In calling the names of the Members, you must understand that you cannot ignore this side. That is not good for healthy traditions. There are 136 Members of one party sitting on this side and they shall not be ignored by 17 Members sitting on the other side in another party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Nobody will be ignored. I called Mr. A.G. Kulkarni of your party but he was absent.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Even if Shri Kulkarni was absent, the hance should have come to our party. it still we have not been called.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. P.N. Sukul belongs to your party and he has already spoken on it.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: You have called on Member from that party and again you are calling another Member from that party.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is according to the time at which the notice is given.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: In a short duration discussion it is not according to the time of the notice. It is one Member from this side and one Member from that side.

SHRI M.M. JACOB: This kind of betrayal is not good in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): There is no betrayal.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir ...(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Kindly let Mr. Gopalsamy to have his say, I have called him.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That is your prerogative, that I concede, but (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Prior to that Mr. Sukul was given a chance.

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: So far only one Congress Member has been given a chance. If Mr. Kulkarni was not here, then another Member from this Party should have been called.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: They call themselves one Front. They are not from different parties. Prof. Lakshmanna and Mr. Gopalsamy are from the same National Front.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, ...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If you want Members from only one party to speak, then do we have no right to say we want to participate in the discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): You cannot direct the Chair.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I am not directing. I am asking you.

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: It is a convention of the House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to pay my tributes and salute to the man who spoke on the floor of this House in the year 1987 from the Treasury Benches; the most inspiring and marvellous speech which is still ringing in my ears. That man was the Minister of State for Defence, Hon. Mr. Arun Singh. The House listened to him with rapt attention, pin-drop silence. That was one of the best speeches I have ever heard in my Parliamentary career on the floor of this House. He said, if we find something has been paid, we will definitely pursue each of these questions, what, when, where, how, to whom and why. 'If we are guilty, you hang us'. This was the statement made by Mr. Arun singh on the floor of

the house. He was a man of conscience. He was a man of integrity and honesty. Therefore, when he came to know that Bofors had committed a deliberate fraud on the people of India, he did his duty. He recorded a note. In that note, he clearly said that the very credibility of the Government was at stake; and, what was worse, the credibility of the entire process of defence acquisition was also at stake and that these payments were grossly violative of the stated policy of the Government.

Here is a man who comes and pleads with his conscience; a man true to his conscience, defending the Government. But when he came to know that the Bofors company had committed a fraud on the people of India, he recorded this note. He did his duty. On that, the then Prime Minister, in his note, made this observation. 'It is unfortunate that the Minister of State for Defence has put his personal prestige above the security.' What is this 'personal prestige'? Though Mr. Arun Singh knew all the facts, he did not utter a single word about the note on the floor of the House, when he said, subsequently, about the fraud committed by Bofors. He was an honourable man and, therefore, his conscience pricked him. He resigned. But he did not say anything because he loved his friend. He loved his friend and friends in that camp. And for that, he has been given the tribute that he kept his personal prestige above the security. I do not understand the meaning of this observation made by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, in his note-'Knee-jerk reactions and stomach cramps will not serve any purpose'. What is the meaning of 'knee-jerk reactions'? This is the kind of observation made by the then Prime Minister about his dear friend, Mr. Arun Singh. I am not able to understand the meaning of this phraseology. Perhaps, this may be from the Doon School.

Sir, why was not the note which was recorded by the then Prime Minister despatched till the 21st July, 1987? Only after the resignation of Mr. Arun Singh on the 18th that this note was forwarded. We talk about honesty and integrity. We have the slogan 'Satyameva Jayate' inscribed in the precincts of Parliament. This is also the motto of the Government. But a person who occupies the highest position in the country comes to Parliament and says that whatever was broadcast by the Swedish Radio on the 16th April, 1987, was false, baseless and mischievous. What is the meaning of 'false'? What is the meaning of 'baseless'? What is the meaning of the 'mischievous'? What is the meaning of these words in the dictionary of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, in the dictionary of his camp?

Sir, facts have been totally suppressed and concealed. Bofors committed a fraud on the people of India and, of course, on the Government of India. When it was broadcast by the Swedish Radio, all of a sudden, the then Prime Minister rushes to Parliament and makes a statement that whatever was broadcast was false, baseless and mischievous. Is a person, who suppresses and conceals facts from Parliament, an honourable person? Is a person, who is answerable to Parliament, who is accountable to Parliament and who deliberately suppresses and conceals facts from Parliament, an honourable person? This is my question. (*Interruptions*) I am coming to the point. I am framing my question. I would like to know from the Government headed by Shri Vishwananth Pratap Singh, is it not a fact that Martin Ardbo had made a note in his diary that Mr. 'G' should be protected at any cost? Who is this Mr. 'G'? When I asked the same question from Mr. Chidambaram, the then Minister of State for Home Affairs, he said jocularly that 'G' means Mr. Gopalsamy. I retorted, 'G' means God also, but I was not a party to sign the Bofors deal. This 'Mr. G' has been written by Mr. Martin Ardbo in his diary. I would like to know, who is Mr. 'G'?

Secondly, I would like to know whether the former Prime Minister had a meeting with Mr. Olof Palme privately in

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

a five-star hotel in Sweden? Many things have been stated about Moresco and Moineau. (*Interruptions*). I am not yielding. I am framing the question. I am not yielding.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): I am trying to help you. I want to tell you...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I do not want your help. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): He is not yielding. You please take your seat.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: He is misleading the House. (*Interruptions*). I want to help you. Please yield for a moment. If you had asked me to yield, I would have yielded ten times.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: No, I am not yielding. You are an honourable gentleman. You want to distract me and I am not going to be the pray of your trick. I do not need your assistance. (*Interruptions*). You assist your own colleagues. They need your assistance.

Sir, when Panama intervention was condemned by this Government, these poeple were very critical, they were asking why strong words were not used. Mr. Subramanian Swamy also stated that Mr. Noriega deposited billions of dollars worth money in Swiss Bank. Mr. Noriega is alleged to be connected with drug scandals, narcotic trafficking. Will this Government try to find out whether or not Mr. Noriega had meeting with Mr. Hinduja in London? Then only something will come out. I am saying this because Mr. Martin Ardbo has written something about them in his diary, that he had a breakfast meeting with Mr. Hinduja.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: What was the menu?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Menu I do not know, you have to find out. Sir, our friends from this side have been demanding that these notes, records and files should be placed before the House.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: How much commission did you receive?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: For 2½ years you have been doing all these things. Of course, Mr. Shiv Shanker may not know, but people, like Mr. Fotedar, were very anxious. He was anxious even before he was the Minister. Now that the papers and documents have been made available by the Prime Minister we have come to know that the then Government tried to cover up and suppress the facts, tried to protect the culprits.

Therefore, Sir, this message of the clandestine operation done by the previous Government should be taken to every nook and corner of this country, to every town, every hamlet and every village and then next time in the South also you will be rejected. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You tell us what happened to you in Tamil Nadu. People have completely ignored you.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then people will say, "even if you put butter in our mouth, that will not help." Now the Parliament has come to know that the then Government tried to protect the culprits and suppress the facts. Therefore, I would congratulate the Government for bringing these facts to Parliament and through Parliament to the people of India. Thank you.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition had raised a very important preliminary point and he had also reminded the hon. Prime Minister of his categorical assurance that the entire records of the Government relating to the Bofors contract shall be made available to Parliament. The demand made by the Leader of the Opposition remains unanswered, the assurance given by the Prime Minister remains unhonoured and we continue to face the barrage of debate under the cover of a Short Duration Discussion for the last more than two hours.

[**The Deputy Chairman** in the Chair]

Madam, the statement which has been placed before this hon. House by the Prime Minister by itself leaves no manner of doubt that there can be no meaningful discussion on this subject until and unless the record which has been specifically referred to in the statement itself is made available to the Members. This statement contains inferences and the statement in turn says that these are the inferences based on the records. And we are being asked to discuss the statement. Are we supposed to discuss the inferences without having any access to the records on which those inferences are based? I draw the attention of this hon. House to paragraph 4 of this statement which says, the records show that there was a flurry of activity on the receipt of the Swedish National Audit Bureau report. The then Government immediately took the decision to go about setting up a Joint Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the whole matter. Madam, kindly notice the language which has been used in this inference. It is loaded with insinuations. It says, there was a flurry of activity and the Government of India immediately took the decision to go about setting up a Joint Parliamentary Committee as if the Report of the Swedish National Audit Bureau contained such a damaging material that in order to cover it up the Government entered into a flurry of activity and took a *mala fide* decision to set up the Joint Parliamentary Committee. This inference is based on the record. It says, "The records show." I, as a Member of this hon. House, demand from the hon. Prime Minister to place on the table of this hon. House the entire record on which this inference has been based. I will then be able to show whether this inference is right or whether this inference has been couched in a most mischievous language. We are being denied the right of access to this record because such patently mischievous statements are sought to go unchallenged.

A.M 1.00

Then, I draw the attention of this hon. House to another portion of this statement. In para 12 it says:

> "It is established on record that the officers and Ministers concerned at that time were all of the view that action should be taken against Bofors on these ground."

Are we not entitled to have an access to this record on which this statement has been based? How are we going to judge whether this statement is true or it is false? The record is not made available to us. We are asked to accept as a gospel truth this assertion made in the statement:

> "It is established on record that the officers and Ministers concerned at that time were all of the view that action should be taken against Bofors..."

I believe that the statement in paragraph 18 has been made in response to repeated demands made by one hon. Member who has been saying that this Government has been dragging its feet despite all its tall promises made during the elections because it has nothing to offer. How does the statement end? Para 18 says:

> "Our first step has been to expeditiously review the existing position with a view to revitalising the investigative effort necessary in this case."

This is a very tall statement, and the tall statement has been made on the basis that the first step which this Government has taken is expeditiously reviewing the relevant records. What are we asking for? We are only asking for the relevant records. It is the statement of the hon. Prime Minister himself that the relevant records have been persued. It is on the basis of these relevant records that this statement has been made. But you cannot have access to those relevant records. Why? The specious plea which has been forthcoming is that much of the record relates to sensitive defence material.

What is that sensitive defence material

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

concerning the Bofors contract, may I ask? There can be only three aspects of the entire records relating to Bofors.

The first aspect was the selection of the guns by Army Headquarters. What is the secret about it? What is the sensitivity of this material on account of which this material is being withheld by the hon. House?

The second part of the record would be the record of negotiations conducted by the negotiating committee with those parties whose guns were short-listed and recommended by the Army Headquarters. Is there anything sensitive that can possibly be about that particular record? Those negotiations culminated in approval of the recommendations of the negotiating committee. The approval is granted by the then Minister of Finance. Is it that the grant of the approval by the then Finance Minister to the recommendations of the negotiating committee is a sensitive material and, therefore, it has to be withheld from the Members of this hon. House? Is it because it may involve the conduct of the former Finance Minister in granting approval to this contract that this material is being withheld? On the charge the hon....

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will read out that portion right now.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I am not interested in reading the portion. I am interested in the entire file. I respectfully submit it is no answer to do now after I raised the point to say that he will read that portion. Why does not that find a place in the statement that the approval was granted by the then Finance Minister to the entire recommendation of the negotiating team? Why has this been suppressed from the statement? Because I have brought this out, the Prime Minister stands up and says because he happens to be the former Finance Minister that he will place that portion on the Table of the House. This is neither here, nor there. It is not fair to the hon. House. Madam, I respectfully submit in these circumstances the record which has been withheld from this hon. House has been withheld on grounds totally extraneous—and this is my charge against the Government and against the hon. Prime Minister—to the ground which has been advanced by the hon. Prime Minister in justification of the withheld material.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief. It is Half-an-Hour discussion.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I just want to say a few words. Despite the fact that we have been handicapped and there can be no fruitful discussion in the absence of the material, I would just like to make one or two comments on the statement. The very opening sentences of the Statement show total ignorance on the part of the person who has drafted this statement for the hon. Prime Minister, of total forgetfulness on the part of the Prime Minister for having not checked it. The opening sentence says: Ever since the news broke in April 1987 that large payments had been made as Commission, इसका तो जुमला ही गलत है। The opening news was broadcast by the Swedish Radio on 16th of April, 1987 and that broadcast did not talk about the commissions at all.

That broadcast alleged that bribes have been paid to high officials and politicians but there was no reference to the commissions at all. The question of commission came up before the Parliament only when the former hon. Prime Minister made a statement before the hon. House that what to talk of bribe, I even tried to stop the payment of commissions by giving directions to that effect. It was not necessary for him to go into the question of payment of commissions. ...*(Interruptions)*... Whether there should be middlemen or there should not be middlemen, there is nothing criminal about it. It was an administrative decision and we share the administrative decision which he had taken as the Prime Minister of India for the first time that he would brook no

middlemen and no payment of commissions so far as defence deals are concerned when the question of commission came up before the Parliament.

I submit that at page 13 there is an amazing statement. I will only deal with this portion, then, I will ask a few questions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief. It is very late. We have one more discussion.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Just to tell you of the statement, I will quote. He says on page 13 "The Public Prosecutor of Stockholm in Sweden had started enquiries in this case and had made a request for assistance through Interpol in September, 1987. This request was considered in a meeting held on 1st October, 1987, taken by the Home Minister and attended by the Minister of State and the Defence Secretary, and it was decided"– It is improtant—"to divert this request to JPC. It seems that no response was made and no cooperation was extended to the Public Prosecutor in Stockholm, Sweden." Madam, it is an amazing statement. The Joint Parliamentary Committee representing the highest democratic institutions of this nation is supposed to extend cooperation to a District Prosecutor in Stockholm. Is this the manner in which this Government wants to restore the dignity of the institutions of this nation? I could understand that if the Public Prosecutor did not extend any cooperation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But it is baffling that a responsible person, no less than the Prime Minister of India is making a statement that the Joint Parliamentary Committee did not extend cooperation to the District Public Prosecutor of Sweden. It is a matter of shame. Apart from this, the statement which has been made says "started enquiries in this case and had made a request for assistance through Interpol in September, 1987." The statement is delightful and sweetly vague and has been kept vague.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The former Prime Minister was having a lawyer like this.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Yes, he is in the habit of making personal remarks. He often has been making personal remarks against me and I treat them with the contempt which he deserves. He says: "The Public Prosecutor of Stockholm made a request for assistance through Interpol." May I know for what kind of assistance and from whom? The report does not say so and I give the reasons why it does not say so. It is factually incorrect and misleading. If the record had come before this hon. House, I would have shown that this statement has been deliberately made in a most misleading manner. This is the report which was given by the District Prosecutor, Sweden and he says in this report. While closing the inquiry he made a request through the agency of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to the competent authority in Switzerland for information concerning persons authorised to make withdrawals from the accounts in question. Number two, representatives of the Nobel group have been questioned. There is not a single whisper in his report that he ever made any request for cooperation or assistance from the Government of India in regard to any particular matter or from the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. I have got a number of speakers.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Just a minute, Madam. This statement has deliberately suppressed the press release which the public prosecutor issued and in this press release he said, there was nothing in his report to show that the payments made by Bofors in connection with the large orders from India were not in fact winding-up costs. This was the conclusion of this public prosecutor who has been misquoted in this particular statement. Madam, Winston Churchill once said about White Paper, 'Check your buttons before you leave'. This statement deser-

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

ves no better. I ask two questions. Will the hon. Prime Minister tell us, is it correct that when the news broke out, the Government of India approached the Swedish Government for information on the basis of which the broadcast had been made and the Swedish Government, on the request of the Government of India requested the Swedish Audit Bureau to make an investigation into this matter and if that be so, why is it that this statement does not contain even a whisper of this sequence of events and merely jumps straightway to the statement? The report of the Swedish National Audit Bureau was made available to the Government as if this National Audit Bureau was acting on its own, submitted the report to the Government of India and took the Government of India by surprise.

Then Madam, I would like to ask, was the decision to constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee taken before Mr. Arun Singh wrote the note or after that? The statement is totally silent on this and that will show the relevance and the validity of the statement or the note which was put up by Mr. Arun Singh.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Are you questioning the integrity of Mr. Arun Singh?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I am not questioning the integrity of Mr. Arun Singh. But I am questioning the conduct of the Government in withholding the material and the entire record from this House. I would like to ask what Mr. Arun Singh ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: What has been his view on action against Bofors? You have not said about it.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I have already said the action that he has taken against Bofors has turned out to be nothing but a mouse from a mountain.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: So more action should be taken. Do you agree?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I would have given my comments on that also but I am not going to make more comments on the mouse. (*Interruption*). Is it correct, I would ask that the CBI invoked the assistance of Interpol to discover the identity of the three companies and if it is so, why has this information not been divulged in this statement? Is it correct that the Government of India also approached the Swiss authorities I believe in 1988 or 1989 itself seeking full information about the identity of the persons holding the accounts into which any alleged payment was made by Bofors? If that be so, why this information has not been divulged in this particular statement? Then, what are the contents of the communication which was sent to the Attorney-General on which he gave the opinion and was there any other material, apart from any particular communication sent by the Ministry of Defence on the basis of which he formed the opinion? I respectfully submit, Madam, when a lawyer is approached and he is asked the opinion, he gives an opinion on the basis of the material which is placed before him. Did he give opinion on the basis of simply a letter written by the Ministry of Defence having its own assessment of what is the engagement of a middleman? Is it that the entire material was placed before the Attorney-General? Is it not correct that the opinion which has been given by the Attorney-General is, therefore, hypothetical based on ifs and buts? This matter has to be explained. (*Interruptions*). Is it not a fact that an amendment of the Code of Criminal Procedure was carried out by the previous Government only for the purpose of strengthening its hands to garner the information from the Swiss authorities? Is it or is it not a fact? I respectfully submit, Madam, that cribbed and confined as I am, in the absence of the file which has not been placed before this hon. House in breach of the

assurances and in breach of the rights of Members of Parliament and in violation of the very content of this document, I will still insist that my questions may be answered. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I have a couple of more Members to speak on this subject and the hon. Prime Minister has to reply. And then we have another discussion on the economic situation. I would request Members to be really brief and stick to the points. (*Interruptions*). I would also like to ask Members whether they are still interested to have the discussion on *the economic situation after this.*

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Yes, because that is very important. We should discuss it so that this Government can take some steps to bring down the prices.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I accept everything that you say about that. Save me from the discussion.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Madam, we are very much interested in having a discussion on the economic situation (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Anand Sharma.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार): मैडम, इनसे पहले मेरा नाम है।

उप सभापतिः मैं आपको भी बुलवा लूंगी।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः मेरा नाम है। मैंने देखा है बिल्कुल भाटिया जी के बाद मेरा नाम है।

उप सभापतिः मैं आपको बुलवा लूंगी।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः नहीं, मुझे बुलवा लीजिए। यह बड़ी पार्टी के हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उप सभापतिः आपने मेरा सीक्रेट पेपर कैसे देखा?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः मैंने आपकी अनुमति से देखा था।

उप सभापतिः राम अवधेश जी, उन्होंने खाना नहीं खाया है, आप तो घर से खाना खाकर आ गए। उन्हें जल्दी से बोलकर घर जाने दीजिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः मेरी प्रार्थना है कि मुझे जल्दी बुलवाया जाए।

उप सभापतिः कभी तो सुन लिया कीजिए। जिन्दगी में एक बार तो सुन लिया कीजिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः अब यह तो 20 मिनट लेंगे और फिर आप मुझे कहेंगी कि...(**व्यवधान**)...

उप सभापतिः देखिए समय नहीं है। यों तो मैं वैसी भी आपको कम ही बुलवाऊंगी, चाहे पहले बुलवाऊं या बाद में।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः अच्छा तो पहले ही बुलवा दीजिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, may I make a constructive suggestion? Last night, the Leader of the House gave us the dinner. This morning, the Leader of the Opposition should give us the breakfast.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would request the Leader of the Opposition to arrange for the breakfast.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am prepared to oblige the Finance Minister if he comes to my house. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam Deputy Chairman, the House is discussing a subject which has been discussed in this House and in the other House at least eight times...

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Several times.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: ...during the last 2-1/2 years and this particular subject was made the general issue in the last General Election and was used as a political charge, not only to malign the then Government, but also to mount a sustained campaign of vilification against the institution of Prime Minister. From March 1987 till the time of the General Election, this campaign of vilification which was packed with insinuations and innuendos to create misgivings among the people of this country, was timed to climax with the last General Election. When in the various newspapers, pages of the so-called

[Shri Anand Sharma]

Ardbo diary, referred to by Mr. Gopalsamy, were published, we were both amused and shocked to find that the very author of that diary denied its contents and he has gone on record to say that this was never his diary. I say this because the diary pages were published in the papers and the denials were also published in the papers and, so, I have every right to refer to that.

Madam, today, when the Prime Minister read out a statement and the Leader of the Opposition and the other colleagues on this side raised some objections, we were right. After all, what does this diary contain? This statement which has been made today contains only what has earlier been alleged or published in the "Indian Express", which is certainly a Bible to many, and also in the "Hindu" newspaper. There is nothing additional in this. But I will certainly congratulate the authors for their cleverness because this statement has been coined and designed to creat an erroneous impression that the previous Government did not do something or did not act on the note of the then RRM, did not comply with the request of the Swedish Prosecutor-General, Mr. Ringberg, or did not act upon the advice of the Attorney-General. But the statement very conveniently excludes what all was done by the previous Government and the then Prime Minister. If I have to remind the honourable Prime Minister, the last page of this statement, page 14, refers to some other future action and that is the paragraph about a memorandum of understanding. If you really wanted to be fair and if you wanted this House to be properly informed, where was the harm in placing this on record that the previous Government had signed a memorandum of understanding, that it was the previous Government which had facilitated not only the signing of this memoramdum of understanding, but also, to meet the initial requirements, that is, of reciprocity and dual criminality, the Criminal Procedure Code was amended?

Where was the harm in putting in your statement that the letter rogatory was signed by the previous Government and sent to the Swedish authorities? Not once, but twice, to the same Prosecutor-General of Sweden to whom you have referred in your statement and you have also referred to the previous Government not referring his request or not acting upon his request. The same Prosecutor-General had also sent a letter rogatory to the Swiss Government which was rejected.

When an impression is given that in September 1987 this request was made and the assistance was sought by the Swedish Prosecutor, if my memory serves me right, hon. Prime Minister, at that time the joint Parliamentary Committee was already constituted, would it have been a breach of privilege on the part of the then Government not to refer that request from the Swedish Prosecutor to the Joint Parliamentary Committee? Since you talk of respecting institutions, of upholding the dignity of institutions, whether the friends on this side participated in the JPC, the JPC was a body of Indian Parliament, it would have meant disrespect to that body if this information and request was held from them. Today when we demand that everything would be placed here then we are told that no, that is not possible because some sensitive information is also there. We were told that ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: When the Leader of the Opposition demanded full record, this is what was said. When the Leader of the House in the lower House demanded this, the Prime Minister was indulgent enough to say that full record will be placed on the Table of the House. (*Interruptions*) Let him deny. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam Deputy Chairman, when this is being said today, it was discussed to this extent

that it could be laid in the Chamber of the Chairman and the leaders of the Opposition and leaders of various parties could go and have a look at that. But, Madam, I would like to say today that those who are trying to hide under the cloak of secrecy and sensitivity of documents had no compulsion to create a situation and to put pressure on the then Government when threatening build-ups across the borders, both on the western border and north-eastern border, were sought to be discussed in the streets. It was at the same time that attempts were made to demoralise the Indian Army by making a palpably false statement.

Throughout the country it was the campaign that the weapon is wrong, the ammunition is wrong and the life of the Jawans is threatened. Let the friends on the treasury benches deny that their leaders did not make this statement. I am very happy when the statement today includes the office note of Gen. Sunderji, the then chief of Army Staff. Gopalsamyji was also referring to that. Others were also referring to that. I am sure we all have highest regard for Gen. Sunderji, his judgment, his integrity. I hope you will all agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am happy, Sir. May I also remind if you really hold him in that high esteem--at least we do ...(*Interruptions*) I will tell you, prof. Lakshmanna now. Do you also agree with that statement of Gen. Suderji when he said that those leaders of the Opposition who are saying that this weapon is sub-standard weapon, that the ammunition which is being used is sub-standard, are misleading, politicising it, are a bunch of crooks and he singled out Prof. Lakshmanna, your leader, and N.F. Chairman, Rama Rao, and he called them crooks... I am quoting Sunderji. Now, here him again. He said that there cannot be dual standards. Please hail both the statements of General Sunderji. (*Intrruptions*). I am not provoking you. I am only placing his views on record.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In spite of this observation, we don't carry on a slanderous campaign against him.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Well, you have carried, Sir. Otherwise, there was no manifesto. Let us be very honest. You have yourself said that this was the core issue for the elections.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I seek your indulgence. I would like to quote what Gen. Sunderji has said about the quality of the gun. he said:

> "No. I am sorry. As far as I am concerned, as far as the Army is concerned, it is bloody fundamental. I am not a politician. I am not interested in politics. I care too hoots for the ruling party. I couldn't care less about the bloody opposition. The quality of the gun is being used more and more today by the opposition as an electoral gimmick. They are a bloody immoral, dishonourable lot. Mr. Rama Rao quotes me to say I am supporting his contention that it is a bad gun and our defences are being jeropardised. I am very upset with that man for insisting that it is a bad weapon and is being foisted on the armed forces, and because of that our defence preparedness is being jeopardised. It is wrong, immoral and irresponsible."

Please hail it and thump the desk.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You should not blame Rama Rao for it. it is Upendra who drafted it.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Before I come to two or three specific points, I would, in fact, like to thank the Government of the day and the hon. Prime Minister for publishing in full the note of Mr. Arun Singh. I will have to remind the House that, at that time, the J.P.C. had already been constituted. I will quote three sentences which many speakers from the Treasury Benches have carefully avoided. It is the Prime Minister's note. It says:

[Shri Anand Sharma]

"The R.R.M. has run the Ministry fairly well. But there is no reason to panic especially if one's conscience is clear."

This was the note of the former Prime Minister. This is the focal point. At that time also he was crystal clear that there is no reason to panic when the conscience is clear.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Whose conscience?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Certainly not yours. Everybody knows whose conscience is clear and time will vindicate it. Well, at least, for Mr. Ram Rao's statement the people of Andhra Pradesh have already given a certificate. (*Interruptions*) Madam, tell him to go to his seat if he wants to interrupt me. Look at this. Now you cut their time and give it to me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They have finished their speeches. They have no time. Please finish, Mr. Anand Sharma.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I will go very fast, Madam. It will certainly go at a faster speed than the speed promised for investigation and ascertaining the identity by the Prime Minister when he was in the opposition. (*Interruptions*) Please bear with me. You are such a senior Member.

Madam, there was a demand for cancellation earlier. There were repeated demands. The statement also says that the cancellation should have been there in 1987. It was at that time when the cancellation was possible. We all know that in January-February, 1987, the hon. Prime Minister was the *Raksha Mantri* then. At that time there was tension on the Indo-Pak border. Or in Mid-1987 when there was a terrible build-up and our forces were eye-ball to eye-ball on the Indo-China border it was possible then or later in the year when we had that situation in Sri Lanka. But it is not possible now because too much of time has elapsed. It is a very interesting situation. And if I have to quote the statement, it says, "those involved in the case have had a plenty of time and opportunity to cover the tracks and build up their alibis. This is a situation which we have inherited." I am quoting from page 13 of the statement which you have made.

Madam Deputy Chairman, during the elections and before that, it was promised to the nation that if the Government had the will, within 15 days or 30 days—I remember 30 days, Mr. Subramanian Swamy said 15 days—the identity of the recipients will come out and a criminal case will be registered here and we will shake up the Swiss Government and tell them give us the names. (*Interruptions*) Nobody came in the way of registering a criminal case. Madam, I am compelled, in fact, to quote certain interviews of the hon. Prime Minister which are there on the TV, on the Newstrack where it has been stated and also in the election speeches—देश की सुरक्षा से समझौता किया गया, घटिया बारूद लाया गया, जवानों की जान खतरे में डाली, जो धरती का नमक खाया है उस नमक की अदायगी होगी या नहीं होगी और जब नमक अदा करने का समय आया तो कहा कि अब देरी हो गई है, कुछ पता नहीं लगा।

I do not understand why this build-up was there and whether it was not a political build-up for a political charge. It will be for the nation to judge because this Government owes it to the nation because it had promised it to the nation, it has come to the power on that assurance. on that promise. So, we do not certainly want to hear this, when you talk of the cancellation, may I ask you one thing? I will not go into the main contract. But their statement says at page 12, "Of the two contracts, namely the Supply Contract and the Licence Agreement for Licence Production in India, the Supply Contract stands nearly fulfilled and the Company has already received the bulk of the payment due to them." *(Time bell rings)* Madam, I am just concluding. Now you have claimed that you have already taken action and told them that there will be no future contracts. This means debar-

ring them from future contracts. And the alert Member of the House, Shri Subramanian Swami has read the reactions of the Bofors. But may I ask you one thing? All right, as far as the main agreement is concerned, may be your view and my perception could be different, that it could have been cancelled in 1987, though I do not agree. But you do not want to cancel it now. All right. But what about the licence to manufacture because you have yourself said that it is yet not finalised. So, you are referring to action only about the future contracts, not even those agreements which are in the pipeline. This means that you want to conclude that, I would like to know. What about the supply contract and the licence contract? Please let us know that. Now the ball is in your court. You tell us whether you are cancelling or not. (*Interruption*) अरे भाई, बात यह है कि आप वहां के स्पोकमैन का दर्जा ले लीजिये।

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: When Arun Singh demanded that firm to be blacklisted, you pressed the services of Chidambaram and Dinesh Singh to oppose that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please conclude now.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam, I am concluding now. Dipen Ghoshji was very kind.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But you are aware of it; I was not aware of that. I demanded that to be blacklisted. I was on that side.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam, I have got just to say one more thing....

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You brought Chidambaram and Dinesh Singh here to speak against that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I do not know from which side he is speaking because his condition is that of a Trishanku. I do not know what he is speaking...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I an not in the position of Trishanku...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: That everybody knows.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: On the other matter, I wish you remain on that side. And as long as you will remain on that side, we will be benefiting and we will get more information because once you come back, we will be shut out of this information.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am about to conclude. There is a talk of the money being returned. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether it is a fact or not that this action was initiated by the previous Government, that this action had started then, that a tentative agreement had already been reached between the Defence Ministry and AB Bofors and there is an office note of the former Defence Minister available in the Prime Minister's office which states that a tentative agreement has been reached with AB Bofors for the return of Rs. 60 crores. I demand here, please place that note on the Table of the House. Let us see what is the truth. Who has taken action? I demand, either you deny the existence of this note or if you do not deny, place it on the Table of the House. Let us put the record straight. (*Interruptions*).

Madam, one thing has been said repeatedly and since it was uttered just now, that compels me to react on that. They had said that we cannot— Mr. Jethmalani and others were saying— that we cannot place the record because it could be used by potential culprits to tailor their defence and also they have been saying simultaneously in the same breath that the previous Government despite all the action which I have cited, was trying to cover up or protect the culprits. Now, both these statements cannot be correct. If your first statement is correct that the

previous Government was trying to shield the identity, then this means that you should have no hesitation to place the record. But if you mean the other statement to be correct, then they had already access to the record. If they had no access, then how can you level the charge of cover up, how can you level the charge of shielding the culprits? Answer me. Both these statements cannot be correct. You cannot have dual standards. Make one statement at least, for heaven's sake. Elections are over and you have misled the people all right and got the votes. *(Time bell rings).*

Madam, I cannot certainly annoy you in the early hours of the morning. You have been every indulgent.

Madam, I will say only one thing that from this statement it is clear that this was a political build up, this was a political charge and an attack was mounted on the institution of the Prime Minister through insinuations, and Madam Deputy Chairman, what have they tried to do. They have sought to condemn an institution and the political leadership, the then political leadership of the country without any shred of evidence. They have not honoured their commitment to the nation and now they are coining advance excuses to justify their future failure. They owe an answer to the nation. And let me remind you, Madam, I will be too happy and so will be my colleagues on this side, if your Government succeeds not only in identifying who the recipients were but giving them exemplary punishment. We will be very happy. But so far it only shows that you are only trying to place parts, selective parts, of what you have inherited as far as the action taken is concerned. You do not have the courage to inform the nation of the totality of the action taken, including the agreement for the return of the money. This Bofors barrel you were riding during the elections. This barrel may become hot and slippery with the passage of time. Please watch. Thank You.

ठाकुर जगतपाल सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश): तुम्हें यही बोफोर्स खाएगा ...**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Ram Awadhesh Singh. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, why don't you combine the next item with this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is different, about the report of the Economic Advisory Council. If Members are still serious...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: We want it. We can withdraw some of our speakers. But they should also do so.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am prepared to withdraw.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I cannot withdraw.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: If you withdraw, there will be lot of space in the House.

उपसभापति: राम अवधेश जी, अब देखिए, हाफ एन आवर डिसक्शन तो अब हो गया, जिनका नाम था वे बोल गये, अब जो बोलने वाले हैं वे खाली जो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यहां पर अपना स्टेटमेंट दिया था उस पर क्लैरीफिकेशन मांग रहे हैं तो कृपया क्लैरीफिकेशन करें, भाषण करने की तकलीफ न करें और सिर्फ क्लैरीफिकेशन के सवाल करें।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: जब मैं खड़ा होता हूं तो आप ऐसी ही बात करती हैं। आप भी आदत से लाचार हैं, हम भी आदत से लाचार हैं।

उपसभापति महोदया, मैं आभारी हूं आपके प्रति कि आपने समय दिया। महोदया, बोफोर्स एक ऐसा मुद्दा है कि जितना इस पार्लियामेंट का समय इसने लिया है, इतिहास में शायद किसी मुद्दे ने नहीं लिया है। यह बोफोर्स का भूत ऐसा सवार हो गया है भारत की संसद पर, सड़क में, गली में, बाजार में...

उपसभापति: इसलिए तो मैं सुबह सुबह आपका भूत उतार रही हूं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: और यह बोफोर्स का भूत इतना शैतान है कि वह प्रधान मंत्री की कुर्सी के अगल बगल ज्यादा रहता है। उधर जो प्रधान मंत्री

राजीव साहब थे उनकी अगल बगल पहुंच गया और वे बोफोर्स की फाइल बचाने में इधर से उधर चले गये और ये प्रधान मंत्री आये। अब इनके पास बोफोर्स का भूत आ गया है और उसकी फाइल को बचाने में लग रहा है कि इनको फिर उलटकर उधर कर देगा। अब यह बोफोर्स वाला ऐसा मामला है कि जो आता है वह बोफोर्स को बचाने की कोशिश करता है और बचाने में फंस जाता है, जैसे बंदर जाल में फंस जाता है, जितना हाथ पांव मारता है उतना ही फंसता जाता है।

यह जो बयान प्रधान मंत्री जी का आया है में उसी पर कन्सनट्रेट करके कुछ लाइनें पढ़ना चाहता हूं और मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि इस बयान के बाद फिर क्यों टालमटोल हो रही है प्रधान मंत्री की तरफ से कागजात रखने में या फाइल रखने में, मैं केवल पैराग्राफ 3 पढ़ रहा हूं-

> "स्वीडन नेशनल आडिट ब्यूरो की रिपोर्ट सरकार को जून 1987 में प्राप्त हुई थी, हालांकि उस रिपोर्ट का एक महत्वपूर्ण भाग स्वीडन की सरकार ने भारत सरकार को नहीं दिया था, फिर भी यह स्पष्ट रूप से साबित होता था कि उक्त भारतीय करार के संबंध में बोफोर्स ने कई व्यक्तियों को बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में धन दिया है"

यह आपको मालूम हो गया है। यह फाइल आपके पास है। स्वीडिश नेशनल आडिट ब्यूरो के जो कागज हैं जो तत्कालीन सरकार को दिये गये थे, वे कागज, वह फाइल तो आपके पास है और वह बताती है कि किन किन व्यक्तियों को यह धनराशि दी गयी है तो आप उस कागज को यहां रखने में क्यों कतराते हैं। उसमें जरूर दाल में कोई काला है। अगर दाल में काला नहीं होता तो आप उसी कागज को जो तत्कालीन सरकार को, जो आपने इसमें लिखा है, इस नोट में और बहादुरी से लिखा है, दिया गया है उसको रखते आपने सोचा होगा कि यह आपके पक्ष में जायेगा लेकिन यही आपके खिलाफ जा रहा है आप देश की जनता के सामने जायें और यही छपवा कर बांटें। अगर नहीं बांटेंगे तो देश की जनता इसी नोट को बांटेगी। क्योंकि पूछेगी कि आपने जो यह लिखा है कि पूरा कागज नहीं देने के बावजूद भी आपके पास कुछ नाम मौजूद थे, जिन लोगों ने पैसे लिए है, तो उनके नाम तो बतायें। उस समय तो राजीव सरकार ने नहीं बताया, लेकिन आज तो यह राजा की सरकार बता दे ...**(व्यवधान)**... एक बात यह है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि पैराग्राफ 3 का ठीक विपरीत है, इसको काटने वाला पैराग्राफ 19 है। मैं चाहता हूं कि पैराग्राफ 19 को भी आप याद कर लीजिये कि क्या लिखा है। पता नहीं कि आपने खुद लिखा है या किसी ने लिख कर दिया है। शायद आपने पढ़ा भी नहीं होगा। यदि पढ़ते तो मैं समझता हूं कि इतना कंट्राडिक्ट्री आप इसको रखते ही नहीं। अब मैं इसको पढ़ता हूं, सुनिये—

> "निष्कर्ष के रूप में मैं इस सरकार का यह संकल्प दोहराना चाहूंगा कि कानून के अनुसार कार्यवाई होगी और बिचौलियों को जो पैसा दिया गया है, इसे वसूल किया जायेगा तथा कमीशन लेने वालों का पता लगाया जायेगा।"

तो जितने का पता चल गया है, हुजूर, उन पर तो कार्यवाही करें। **(समय की घंटी)** जिसका पता नहीं चला है, पता लगाइयेगा। लेकिन जितने का पता चला है, उस पर तो कार्यवाही करके देश की जनता को बताइये। लेकिन आप उसको भी ढकना चाहते हैं। पैराग्राफ 3 में जो बात कही, वह ठीक उसके उलटी बात है। अब पैरा 3 से मैं इसको जोड़ कर पैरा 19 को कहता हूं। पैरा 3 में आपने कहा कि पता चल गया है और इसी में, आपके नोट में, पैराग्राफ 4 में जो नोट है, अरुण सिंह का, उसमें अरुण सिंह ने भी कबूल किया है, जिसके नोट पर आपको गर्व है कि बहुत अच्छा किया है, आपके हक में किया है, राजीव गांधी के खिलाफ किया है, उसी की मैं एक पंक्ति पढ़ता हूं--

> "मैं यह समझता हूं कि नेशनल आडिट ब्यूरो की रिपोर्ट ने स्पष्ट रूप से इस बात की पुष्टि की है कि भुगतान किये गये हैं।"

और आप — भी अपने नोट में कह रहे हैं नेशनल आडिट ब्यूरो के कि यह भुगतान किये गये हैं। तो फिर क्या बात है, आखिर चोर कहां है आपके मन में, इसको बचाना चाहते हैं? कोई बात जरूर है, नहीं तो जिस तलवार को लेकर भागते रहे सारे देश में कि सरकार उलटने पर या सरकार पलटने पर आपकी हुकूमत बनेगी, तो हम इन लोगों को ललका गोल घर में बिठा देंगे, जेल में उनको बिठा देंगे, ठूस देंगे। तो आखिर कहां गई वह तलवार आपकी? ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैं कांग्रेस के पक्ष में नहीं हूं।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: वह तलवार लकड़ी की थी।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: मैं कांग्रेस के पक्ष में इस जीवन में नहीं हो सकता हूं, लेकिन मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि राजा साहब दो जीभ से क्यों बोलते हैं? मैं इनको देख रहा हूं कि पिछले एक-डेढ़ साल से बराबर यह दो

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

जीभ से बोलते हैं, कभी एक जीभ से नहीं बोलते और कभी तो कहेंगे कि मैं यह काम करूंगा, कभी वह काम करूंगा। इनका डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर कहता है कि हम आर्थिक आधार पर आरक्षण चाहते हैं **(समय की घंटी)** यह कहते हैं कि मंडल कमीशन करेंगे। **(समय की घंटी)**

उपसभापतिः इसका बोफोर्स से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः अच्छा, मैं इसे छोड़ देता हूं और दूसरी बात पर आता हूं।

उपसभापतिः बस, अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः अच्छा, मैं इसको छोड़ देता हूं क्योंकि इनमें दम नहीं है। यह तो नाटकबाजी करके इधर-उधर काम चलाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन इनमें दम नहीं है कि यह अपनी बात पर अड़े रहें। यह किसी बात पर नहीं अड़ सकते क्योंकि इनकी हालत ऐसी हो गई है कि एक राजा था। उसकी दो बीवियां थीं। बस मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूं। तो राजा का दुमहला मकान था। एक बीवी नीचे रहती थी और दूसरी ऊपर रहती थी। **(समय की घंटी)** एक मिनट सुन लीजिए। वह जब कोठे पर जाने लगा, तो नीचे वाली बीवी ने बांह पकड़ ली कि नहीं-नहीं नीचे रहो और ऊपर वाली ने कहा कि नहीं ऊपर चलो। दोनों खींचने लगीं। रात तक यह इसी तरह चलता रहा, तो चोर लोग घुसा था राजा के घर में। वह देखता था कि जब ये लोग सीढ़ी से हटें तो हम चोरी करें। रात बीत गई, तो चोर लोग पकड़ा गया। सवेरे राजा के दरबार में चोर को पेश किया गया।

2.00 A.M.

उपसभापतिः अभी सुबह हो गई।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः बस खत्म हो गया, कन्क्लूड कर रहा हूं। तो राजा ने कहा कि चोर को सजा दी जाए। तो कहा कि क्या सजा दी जाए तो राजा ने कहा कि इनको दो शादी करा दी जाए।

उपसभापतिः बोफोर्स से इसका कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। आप बैठ जाइये। राम अवधेश जी बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः चोर को दो शादी करा दी जाए। चोर ने कहा कि हजूर, फांसी दे दी जाए, लेकिन दो शादी नहीं कराई जाए क्योंकि हमने रात भर यह खेल देखा है। अब इनको दो बीवी हैं, एक लैफ्ट और एक राइट। एक इधर खींचती है, एक उधर खींचती है। एक भा०ज०पा० खींचती है, एक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी खींचती है। इनको कोई काम करने नहीं देती। यह मंडल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट इस जन्म में लागू नहीं करेंगे...**(व्यवधान)** क्योंकि भा०ज०पा० कहेगी कि नहीं लागू होना है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी कहेगी कि नहीं, लागू होना है। ...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापतिः राम अवधेश जी, आप बैठ जाइये, बस आप बोफोर्स पर बोल चुके।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः मैं बोफोर्स पर, एक मिनट, लैट मी कन्क्लूड मैडम। एक मिनट, आधा-आधा घंटा आपने दिया है।

उपसभापतिः देखिए, यह बहुत सीरियस चीज़ पर बात हो रही है। सारे हाउस को इस मामले में चर्चा करनी है और करी है इतने घंटे इसको आप मजाक मत बनाइये। ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः मैं एक बात करके खत्म करता हूं । महा न्यायवादी के बारे में जो बात-चीत हुई है उसके बारे में जो कोट किया गया है में उसको कोट करके खत्म करता हूं।

उपसभापतिः वह कोट हो चुका है। बोल चुके हैं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः महा न्यायवादी ने कहा है कि दो काम करना है। एक तो मुकदमा करना है ताकि यह नाम बता दें और दूसरा करार रद्द कर दिया जाए तब वह नाम बता देगा। तो उस सरकार ने किया मुकदमा या नहीं किया, करार रद्द किया या नहीं, उसको गोली मारिए, आपकी सरकार आ गई, क्या महा न्यायवादी के वह दोनों सुझावों को आप मानते हैं? अगर मानते हैं तो मुकदमा करके उस पर दबाव डालिए और जब मुकदमा करेंगे तो वह मज़बूरन नाम देने के लिए बाध्य हो जाएगा या करार रद्द कर दीजिए तो आप दोनों में कौन काम करेंगे यह राजा जी बता दीजिए?

उपसभापतिः बस हो गया, राम अवधेश जी बैठ जाइये। श्री विश्व बन्धु गुप्ता।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः अंतिम बात, एक मिनट महोदया...

उपसभापतिः आपने बहुत बोल लिया, बहुत हो गया, बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंहः एक मिनट सुनिए, यह "वीर अर्जुन" अखबार में निकला है।

उपसभापतिः वीर अर्जुन वगैरह यहां नहीं चलेगा। ...**(व्यवधान)** बस करिए, यह बोफोर्स से ताल्लुक नहीं है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: क्या बात है, बहुत इंपोर्टेंट बोल रहा हूं।

उपसभापति: आपको इंपोर्टेंट लगेगा।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: आप ऐसी बात नहीं कर सकतीं। आप आधा घंटा दूसरे को दीजिएगा। मैं यह बात कर रहा हूं कि यह हर्षमैन, मैं प्रधान मंत्री से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या हर्षमैन अभी भारत में है? क्या प्रधान मंत्री ने बुलाया है?

उपसभापति: इसका कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: क्या बात हो रही है, यह क्या हर्षमैन ...**(व्यवधान)** आप हंसिए मत, यह बहुत गंभीर सवाल मैं इस सदन में पूछ रहा हूं। आप हंगामा मत करिए।

उपसभापति: इससे ताल्लुक नहीं है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: क्या हर्षमैन अभी भारत में है?

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: हमने नहीं बुलाया उनको।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: क्या उससे आपकी बात-चीत हुई है और उसकी रिपोर्ट में क्या अरूण नेहरू का नाम आता है? अगर नहीं आता है तो भी बोलिए और आता है तो भी बोलिए, क्योंकि इस अखबार में आया है। वीर अर्जुन में आया है। ...**(व्यवधान)** अखबार पढ़ लीजिएगा। मैं पढ़ देता हूं। महोदया, अखबार से कोट करने की इजाजत दी जाए।

उपसभापति: मि॰ विश्व बन्धु गुप्ता। बस राम अवधेश जी आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: मुझको अखबार कोट करने दिया जाए।

उपसभापति: मैं आपको अखबार नहीं पढ़ने दूंगी।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: आप इतना कोट करने दीजिएगा क्या हमको दो लाइन नहीं करने दीजिएगा?

उपसभापति: मैं आपको अखबार पढ़ने नहीं दूंगी। आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: पढ़ना नहीं।

उपसभापति: नहीं आप अखबार मत पढ़िए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: आप कोट करने की इजाजत कितनी देती हैं।

उपसभापति: किसी को नहीं देती। ...**(व्यवधान)** ...उनकी पार्टी के सौ से ऊपर मैंबर हैं, आप अकेले तने तनाए हैं इसलिए बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: यह कोई बात नहीं हुई।

उपसभापति: नहीं, बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: यह कोई तर्क हुआ क्या? अभी आनन्द शर्मा जी को कितना कोट करवाया।

उपसभापति: राम अवधेश जी, उनकी पार्टी के 136 सदस्य हैं, आपकी पार्टी के जब 136 सदस्य होंगे तो रात भर बोलना।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: 144 पर तो प्रधान मंत्री बन गए। मेरे 126 हो जाएंगे तो मैं भी प्रधान मंत्री बन जाऊंगा। यह तो छोड़िए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभापति: देखिए, मैंने आपको पहले भी विनती की कि यह सीरियस मैटर है, इसको आप मजाक में मत उड़ाइए। आप कृपया बैठ जाइए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ।

उपसभापति: मैं आपसे प्रार्थना कर लेती हूँ कि आप बैठ जाइए। I request you. Please sit down. Otherwise, if anybody is supporting him, I will take the time of their party. If you want to give your party's time, please give it to him. Otherwise, don't interrupt the House. It is very late. It is not a joke that we are sitting here till 2-00 o'clock to listen to all this. No.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: मैं केवल दो लाईन कोट करना चाहता हूँ वीर-अर्जुन पेपर से, यह कल का अखबार है, पुराना नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उप सभापति: नहीं-नहीं, यह बोफोर्स से ताल्लुक नहीं है। आप कृपया बैठ जाइए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: अच्छा, मैं चाहूंगा कि हर्शमैन के संबंध में जो बात कही गई है, क्या यह बात सही है या नहीं है? क्या भारत में हर्शमैन अभी मौजूद है या नहीं है? इस बारे में बताया जाये।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you speak.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA (Delhi): How can I compete?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As a Member of this House you have to compete-

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I have no intention of inflicting a speech because I cannot compete with Awadheshji. I have known him for a long time. He is a very skilled parliamentarian. However, I come right to the point, Madam.

I know that the hon. Prime Minister is a seeker of truth. He also has a deep commitment to truth as well as to having an open Government with open and maximum information to the people and to the House. I would like to know whether whatever has been placed by the hon. Prime Minister in his statement to the House is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. In case it is not, would he kindly consider placing all the relevant points which my colleagues have mentioned, on the table of the House so that at least this charge cannot be put on him that he is not giving the fullest possible information to the House?

The other question that, I think, might be relevant is that I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he still has had any further information from the former Minister of State for Defence, Mr. Arun Singh, who has been very prominently listed in the statement made. In fact, he has been relying on his statement a great deal about this Bofors controversy. I would like to know whether the hon. Prime Minister has been in touch with him since he has become Prime Minister and whether he has been able to elicit some more information about the Bofors issue from him.

The third point that I would also like to know from the hon. Prime Minister is whether this is going to be the only chapter today about the Bofors controversy, about the issues that have been raised in this debate. Or are there going to be sever other chapters which are going to come one by one so that the maximum exposure can be given to this issue by the media in favour of his Government?

Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Ahluwalia. This is clarification on the statement. This is not a part of the debate. This is clarification. We combined it together.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Instead of seeking clarifications, he should not seek confusion.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): If your mind is confused, there will be confusion. Otherwise not.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: We can't help you.

उपसभापति महोदया, कुछ दिनों पहले चुनाव के दौरान देखा गया कि बड़ी-बड़ी नकली तोपें, बोफोर्स की तोपें बड़े-बड़े ठेलों पर लगाकर दिखाई जा रही थीं और साथ में बड़े-बड़े बयान आ रहे थे कि अगर हम सरकार में आएंगे तो पन्द्रह दिनों के अंदर बोफोर्स के बिचौलियों के रूप में दलाली खाने वालों को हथकड़ी पहनाएंगे।

महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह हथकड़ियां अमेरिका में बन रही हैं? अब तक ये हथकड़ियां क्यों नहीं लगी? किस चीज की कमी रह गयी है हथकड़ियां पहनाने में या हथकड़ियों की कुंजी खो गयी है या हथकड़ियों का साइज नहीं मिल रहा है? क्योंकि आज जो बयान आया है, उसमें बड़े प्यार से इन्होंने लिखा है। पर अब कहने लगे हैं, अब तो उस बयान के माध्यम से कहने लगे हैं कि बहुत देर हो गयी है और बार-बार बड़े नाटकीय ढंग से पूछ रहे हैं हम से कि बताओ बोफोर्स में क्या करना है? मगर हम तो चिंघाड़-चिंघाड़ कर कह रहे हैं कि एक्शन लो, कांट्रेक्ट कैंसिल करो। क्यों नहीं करते? हमारे कहने से आप कर नहीं सकते। उसका भी कारण है क्योंकि जिस दिन कांट्रैक्ट कैंसिल किया आप की सरकार नहीं रहेगी। वह आपके पीछे बैठा आदमी ही आपका प्रधान मंत्री बनेगा। जिस ने बोफोर्स का पैसा खाया है वही आपकी जगह प्रधान मंत्री बनेगा, इतना ध्यान रख लेना।

महोदया, बोफोर्स पर दवाब देकर उससे नाम पूछने की बात कही जाती है। बहुत बड़े-बड़े भाषण बोफोर्स पर सुन-सुनकर थक गए। प्रधान मंत्री महोदय हमारी सरकार ने तो कुछ नहीं किया, आप ही कर के दिखा दें।

लेफ्टीनेंट जनरल हृदयनाथ कौल ने एक बयान दिया था, जो डिप्टी चीफ आफ आर्मी स्टाफ थे, कि साहब मुझे ढाई करोड़ से पांच करोड़ तक की घूस देने के लिए लोगों ने कहा था। कहा कि एक नंबर पर नाम ले आओ लिस्ट में डाल दो। आप ही उनसे पूछिए। कहते हैं मैं फौजी हूं, मैं नाम नहीं बताऊंगा। उससे पूछिए कि कौनसी गन थी और कौन उसका बिचौलिया था? क्या उस गन को भी आप डिबार करने जा रहे हैं? उस कंपनी की बनी हुई गनों को भी डिबार करेंगे जिन्होंने कि ऐसा किया था? जो हमारे मुल्क के इस तरह के अफसरों को या रक्षा मंत्रालय को डायल्यूट करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

जब आप वैल्यू बेस्ड पालिटिक्स की बात करते हैं, उसके साथ-साथ मैं आपसे गुजारिश करूंगा कि सोफमा तोप ने लास्ट मूमेंट तक इस आर्डर को लेने के लिए 101 करोड़ रुपया लुका कर रखा था। कीमत में जोड़कर रखा हुआ था और लास्ट कोशिश की उसने 101 करोड़ रुपये की कीमत घटाकर। वह 101 करोड़ रुपया किसको देना चाहती थी? सरकार आपके पास है, सी०बी०आई० आपके पास है, इंटेलिजेंस आपके पास है, पता लगाइए कि सोफमा तोप के दलाल कौन थे और उन दलालों के साथ मिलने वाले कौन थे? आज उसी सोफमा तोप को बोफोर्स तोप का आर्डर देने की बात जो सोची जा रही है, उसके बारे में भी और विचार कर लें। उसके बारे में आप क्या कहना चाहते हैं? क्योंकि अभी-अभी पाकिस्तान के अखबार "मुस्लिम" में छपा है कि पाकिस्तान सरकार 155 एम०एम० की तोप खरीद रही है। उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए आप सोफमा से नेगोशिएशन नहीं करेंगे? बोफोर्स का यह कांट्रैक्ट कैंसिल कर सोफमा से वह 101 करोड़ रुपए का कमीशन रखकर सौदा नहीं करेंगे? उसकी गारंटी क्या आप हिंदुस्तान की जनता को देते हैं? इन चीजों पर विचार करने की जरूरत है। प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, आपने इंकार किया। आपके साथ बैठनेवाले साथी जब विपक्ष में बैठते थे, रोज चिंघाड़-चिंघाड़ कर कहा करते थे कि ये कागज लुकाए जा रहे हैं। आपने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया उसमें आप 87 से पार नहीं होते। अब 87 के बाद ज़नवरी, 88 शुरू होता है और दो-तीन दिन बाद जनवरी, 90 शुरू होने जा रहा है। इन दो सालों में राजीव गांधी की सरकार के तत्वाधान में बोफोर्स कंपनी के साथ जो कम्युनिकेशन हुआ वह पलाचार क्यों नहीं रखा गया?

बोफोर्स कम्पनी ने जो-जो जवाब दिए, डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री के साथ जो पलाचार किया वह टेबल पर क्यों नहीं रखा गया? वह जरा बताएं कि क्या विचार हुआ था क्योंकि आपने तो शपथ उठा रखी है, अपने मेनिफेस्टो में कहा है कि हम राइट आफ इन्फारमेशन देंगे और जो-जो चीजें लुकाई हुई थीं पहले की सरकार ने, वह सारी बात जनता को बताएंगे। तो आज क्यों पीछे मुड़ रहे हैं? आज क्यों प्रेस गैलरी की तरफ और पीछे झाकं-झांककर नाटक कर रहे हैं? आपको इस पर ध्यान देने की जरूरत है राजा साहब और यह बताएं कृपया कि आप बोफोर्स का जो कान्ट्रेक्ट कैंसिल करने की बात सोच रहे हैं, वह कान्ट्रैक्ट क्या गन का है या जो एम्युनेशन मैन्युफेक्चर करना था उसका है। या भविष्य में जो डि-बार करने की बात कही है, तो क्या अब से आप रक्षा मंत्रालय में टैंडर की प्रथा खत्म करने वाले हैं या आपको पहले से ही भविष्य का ज्ञान हो गया कि साहब को टैंडर का भी अवार्ड उसी को मिलना है, कान्ट्रैक्ट उसी को मिलना था, इसलिए उसको कैंसिल कर दें या डि-बार कर दें? इन चीजों का जवाब हिन्दुस्तान की जनता मांगती है, यह जरा आप क्लीअर करें **(समय की घंटी)** आप कब इसको कैंसिल कर रहे हैं और जो-जो प्रश्न किए हैं, उनका जवाब दें।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, प्रधान मंत्री जी और रक्षा मंत्री जी ने आज इस सदन में बोफोर्स के मामले में जो वक्तव्य दिया है, उस पर चर्चा करने का आपने मौका दिया, मैं कृतज्ञ हूं आपका। तोता-मैना की कहानी तो पुरानी हो गई, अब कोई नई बात प्रधान मंत्री जी को करनी चाहिए। बोफोर्स, बोफोर्स, बोफोर्स—इतनी बार कहा गया कि इस देश की जनता ऊब चुकी है बोफोर्स से और आज जो यह वक्तव्य दिया गया है, यह इस बात का द्योतक है कि वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री और जनता दल के नेता जो कहते हैं, ठीक उसके विपरीत काम करते हैं। इन्होंने कहा था चुनाव के दरमियान कि 30 दिन के भीतर बोफोर्स का कमीशन जिन लोगों ने खाया है उनका नाम बता देंगे और संभवतः शपथ लिए 30 दिन हो गए हैं या हो रहे होंगे और आज जो यह वक्तव्य लेकर आए हैं, इस वक्तव्य में एक भी नई बात का उल्लेख नहीं हैं, जो हम पहले कर चुके हैं। पहले जब आप अपोजिशन में थे तब आरोप लगाया कि बोफोर्स की क्वालिटी ठीक नहीं है और इसी सदन के जसवन्त सिंह, सरदार साहिब—अरोड़ा जी और बापू कालदाते जी, इन तीनों के सामने परीक्षण हुआ बोफोर्स का और जितने किलोमीटर तक उसकी मारक क्षमता थी उससे आगे वह निकली और सारे आपके आरोप झूठे, बे-बुनियादी, निराधार, असत्य और कल्पना पर आधारित निकले। हम जानना चाहते हैं आपसे कि आप जब वित्त मंत्री थे और राजीव गांधी

[डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय]

प्रधान मंत्री थे, तो क्या बोफोर्स या रक्षा मंत्रालय के जितने सौदे होते थे, उन सब कागजों पर वित्त मंत्री के रूप में आपने हस्ताक्षर किए हैं या नहीं किए हैं?

आपने वित्त मंत्री के रूप में स्वीकृति दी है या नहीं यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं। आपने 30 दिन के अंदर नाम बता देने की बात कही थी। हम चाहे अपोजिशन में रहें या सत्ता में लेकिन हमारी जो क्वालिटी है बोफोर्स गन की उसके बारे में सारे देश को कोई शंका नहीं है। आप इस पर क्या कहना चाहते हैं यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं। सबसे अहम सवाल जिसकी ओर अनेक सदस्यों ने आपका ध्यान दिलाया है वह यह है कि आपकी कथनी और करनी में बराबर विभेद रहा है। अभी आपकी जो प्रेस कांफ्रेंस हुई थी उसमें पत्रकारों ने आपसे पूछा कि आप भ्रमास्पद और कंफ्यूज्ड बात कर रहे हैं, साफ बात कीजिए, तो आपका जवाब था कि कंफ्यूजन का वातावरण भी कोई न कोई राता देता है। तो कंफ्यूज्ड वे में इस देश को आप चलाना चाहते हैं या सेंसिबल वे में देश को चलाना चाहते हैं? मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूं कि भारत के वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री चुनाव के समय कुछ कहते हैं और करते कुछ हैं और इस सदन में जो वक्तव्य लेकर आए हैं यह पृष्ठपोषण उन्हीं पुरानी बातों का है जो जनरल सुंदरजी ने कही, अटार्नी जनरल ने कही। उस सब के विस्तार में न जाकर मैं सुंदर जी की कही हुई बातों को उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने कहा था—

'तोप की गुणवत्ता अब मुद्दा नहीं है तो क्या कमियां थीं उसका जवाब दिया गया है—नहीं मुझे क्षमा करें। जहां तक मेरा संबंध है, जहां तक सेना का संबंध है यह बिलकुल बुनियादी मुद्दा है। मैं राजनीतिज्ञ नहीं हूं। राजनीति में मेरी कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है, सत्तारूढ़ दल के लोगों की मैं कोई परवाह नहीं करता। विपक्ष में मेरी दिलचस्पी उससे भी कम है। तोप की गुणवत्ता का इस्तेमाल चुनावी हथकंडे के रूप में विपक्ष द्वारा किया जा रहा है, वह अनैतिक और असम्माननीय लोगों का झुंड है। श्री रामाराव जो संसदीय कार्य मंत्री और सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री से संबंधित हैं, मुझे उद्धृत करते हैं यह बताने के लिए कि मैं किस स्थापना से सहमत हूं। यह खराब तोप है और इससे हमारी सुरक्षा पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ा है। मैं उस आदमी को लेकर ....**(व्यवधान)** प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हिन्दी में शपथ ली थी, इसलिए हिन्दी में *उसको रेकार्ड हो जाने दीजिए, मैडम। यह एक खराब हथियार है* जिसे सशस्त्र सेनाओं पर थोप दिया गया है और इससे हमारी प्रतिरक्षा तैयारियों में व्यवधान पड़ा है, यह गलत है, अनैतिक है और अनउत्तरदायी है और उसके उद्धरण बार बार कोट करना कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं सरकार से कि हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री जी के न गांधी जी आदर्श हैं, न नेहरू जी आदर्श हैं, जिस इंदिरा गांधी ने उनको इस लायक बनाया कि आज प्रधान मंत्री की कुर्सी पर बैठे हैं, जिस राजीव गांधी के साथ उनके राजनीतिक जीवन को पुख्तगी मिली उनमें से किसी का नाम भी उन्होंने नहीं लिया। उन्होंने नाम लिया लोहिया और जयप्रकाश नारायरण जी का ....**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Madam, has it got any connection with Bofors?

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: उन्होंने सेनाओं को भड़काने की कोशिश की। वास्तव में हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री*

उपसभापति: रत्नाकर जी, हमारे हाउस की गरिमा और डिबेट के स्तर से नीचे मत जाइए ...

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय:*

उपसभापति: कौन किसके वंश का है, हम वंशों पर नहीं जाते। मैं आपसे अनुरोध करती हूं कि इस हाउस की गरिमा को, डिबेट के स्तर को नीचे न लाइए ...**(व्यवधान)**

आप को जो कुछ बोफोर्स पर बोलना है बोलिए। कौन कहां पैदा हुआ कहां नहीं हुआ, किस के वंशज के हैं उससे हमें कोई सरोकर नहीं है। मैं किसी के बारे मैं इस प्रकार की बात बर्दाश्त नहीं करूंगी। **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कर रहा हूं। एक स्टेट का राजा ...**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He should withdraw. *(Interruptions)*.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: We insist that these words should be withdrawn. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not be recorded. It will stand expunged. *(Interruptions)*. Just a minute. *(Interruptions)*.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

आप बोफोर्स पर बोलिए। **(व्यवधान)**

प्रो० मधु दण्डवते: प्रधान मंत्री का नाम इज्जत से लीजिए। **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: महोदया, आप गुस्से में मत आइये

तुम्हारी शान घट जाती कि रूतबा घट गया होता, जो गुस्से से कहा था बस वही न कहा होता। **(व्यवधान)**

उप सभापति: आप खामोश रहिये। **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: क्यों नहीं आप को प्राइम मिनिस्टर बताता कि किसने कमीशन लिया है ...**(व्यवधान)** *

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has used a derisive term on and his ancestry. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will ask him. Please withdraw and apologise. It is not good at all. I will not allow you to do it. It is not good. You apologise. It is below certain dignity. Please withdraw. Say 'sorry'. *(Interruptions)*

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं कोई अनपार्लियामेंटरी बात नहीं कह रहा हूं ...**(व्यवधान)**

उप सभापति: अनपार्लियामेंटरी का सवाल नहीं है। यहां सवाल हमारी भाषा का है। **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मेरे पास पूरी सूची है। **(व्यवधान)**

उप सभापति: सूची-वूची आपके पास होगी हमें उससे कुछ नहीं लेना। आप पहले विद्ड्रा कीजिए **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: आप सत्य को झुठला नहीं सकते। **(व्यवधान)**

उप सभापति: आपकी इज्जत में कोई कमी नहीं हो जायेगी अगर इस सदन के सामने कह देंगे। ऐसी बातें हम को नहीं करनी चाहिए। **(व्यवधान)** हम बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं आप आखिरी हमारे स्पीकर हैं इस तरह की बात करके स्तर को मत गिराये।**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI ASHIS SEN (West Bengal): I want to know from the Deputy Chairman whether he has withdrawn or not, before he proceeds further.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If he does not withdraw, I am going to remove it from the records.

SHRI ASHIS SEN: That means, I can say anything and cut it out and continue to err. *(Interruptions)*. Is this your ruling?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It has been the tradition of Parliament that after such words which are not only unparliamentary but derogatory to the tradition ... *(Interruptions)* ... they are not only to be expunged, but they have to be withdrawn. *(Interruptions)* ... has to go out of the House. *(Interruptions)*.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: इसमें अनपार्लियामेंटरी क्या है। **(व्यवधान)** कोई अनपार्लियामेंटरी शब्द मैंने कहा हो तो मैं सजा भुगतने को तैयार हूं। **(व्यवधान)** लेकिन आप मेरी जुबान को जबर्दस्ती नहीं दबा सकते **(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let me handle it. I am protecting the respect and dignity of the House. I have never allowed it to go below certain standards. I will never allow anything which is derogatory against the Prime Minister or any Member. *(Interruptions)*.

आपकी इज्जत कोई खराब नहीं होगी। आप विद्ड्रा कर लें।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैंने कोई अनपार्लियामेंटरी नहीं कहा। अगर कहा है तो आप एक्सपंज कर दीजिए।

उप सभापति: आप बहस मत करिये। आप विद्ड्रा कर लीजिए।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं दृढ़ हूं। मैंने कोई असंसदीय शब्द नहीं कहा है तो किस आधार पर मैं विद्ड्रा करूं **(व्यवधान)**। इतिहास की सच्चाई को इस महान सदन के सामने रखा है। **(व्यवधान)**

उप सभापति: अब आप बैठ जाइये। मैं आपको अनुमति नहीं देती हूं बोलने की। अगर आप नहीं विद्ड्रा करेंगे तो आप कृपया ...**(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैंने कौन-सा ऐसा शब्द कहा है ...**(व्यवधान)**

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

उप सभापति: कुछ भी हो आपने अच्छा नहीं किया। **(व्यवधान)**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, if you want to know what are the words he said, *Probably, you do not know the history of* That is why you do not probably realise what is the strength of the words that he has given. I think these words are to be withdrawn. Mere expunction will not do. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Pandey, you must withdraw those words.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, he must withdraw those words.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pandey-ji, you withdraw इसी में आपका बडप्पन है कि आप विद्ड्रा कर लीजिए **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं विद्ड्रा नहीं करूंगा। **(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down, all of you ...*(Interruptions)*... I request the honourable Members not to get agitated. I understand the responsibility placed upon me as the Presiding Officer and it is my inherent duty to protect the respect and honour of this House. We are proud of the Rajya Sabha, we are proud of our Parliament and we are proud of our democracy. Please, for heaven's sake, do not bring it down ....*(Interruptions)*... खुदा के वास्ते नीचे के स्तर पर मत गिराइये मैं आपसे विनती करती हूं कि आप अपने शब्दों को विद्ड्रा कर लीजिये।

SHRI P. UPENDRA: He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ASHIS SEN: He should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि ...**(व्यवधान)**।

उपसभापति: डेरोगेटरी कुछ भी एलाऊ नहीं करूंगी।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, I want to know from the Leader of the Opposition whether he would justify this. Mr. Shiv Shanker, if I were you, I would apologise to the House ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pandey, you please withdraw. You please withdraw your words. Please apologise and withdraw your words ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: I am not going to apologise and I am not going to withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you please withdraw from the House *(Interruptions)*... You please withdraw from the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, please send him out of the House ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would once again request you either to withdraw your words or withdraw yourself from the House ...*(Interruptions)*... अगर कोई भी डेरोगेटरी बात किसी के खिलाफ, चाहे इधर से हो या उधर से, मैं एलाऊ नहीं करूंगी।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं यह कह रहा था कि ...**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will not allow as long as I am sitting here. I am the custodian of this House and I will not allow anything derogatory against anybody.

अगर सदन के किसी सदस्य के खिलाफ कोई ऐसा शब्द बोलेंगे जिससे किसी की बेइज्जती होती हो तो मैं

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

हरगिज एलाऊ नहीं करूंगी। आप ऐसा कोई रेफरेन्स मत दीजिये जिसमें किसी के बारे में बुराई के साथ हिस्ट्री जुड़ी हुई हो। इसको मैं हरगिज एलाऊ नहीं करूंगी। आप अपने शब्द वापस लीजिये। नहीं तो बाहर चले जाइये।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: महोदया, ...

उपसभापति: श्री पाण्डेय की कोई बात न लिखी जाये।

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Let him withdraw his words or let him withdraw from the House ...(*Interruptions*)...

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: महोदया, मैं जा रहा हूं।

At this stage, the hon. Member left the Chamber.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam Deputy Chairman, I regret what has happened. I offer my apologies to the House, particularly to the Prime Minister.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Madam, we do not want apologies from him. We are thankful to the Leader of the Opposition. We are thankful to him for having shown this courtesy, and I think this is a battle of courtesy. Please do not record his apologies. We do not want it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That was the last speaker. Now, reply.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Madam, Deputy Chairman, I am thankful to the hon. Members and Mr. Subramanian Swamy that he brought this subject and it has given occasion to express our views. I will take first some of the points mentioned by Shri Subramanian Swamy. One thing he mentioned is about delay. I think several Members mentioned about it. Mention was made about the files being at one place. That is not what I found. Fotedarji mentioned 'PMO files' All the files are not at one place, Fotedarji. That was also my problem. I thought they are at one place and I thought I will go and ...(*Interruptions*) There were some files at one place which the Principal Secretary perhaps was not fully aware of, some files the Defence Secretary was not aware of, some files in the Defence Ministry not known to the P.M.'s office. That was the situation. So we needed time to get and collect...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: यह क्या जवाब है कि एक फाइल इधर और....

उपसभापति: राम अवधेश सिंह जी, देखिये आप चुप रहिये। आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: एक फाइल वहां है और एक फाइल यहां है यह सरकार का क्या जवाब है?

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: अखिर ले तो आये। शुरू की, पहले दिन की बात बता रहा हूं। ले तो आये।

Then on a serious matter like this there was need of study. We started action on the 12th. The Principal Secretary took a meeting. On the 12th of December the interpol organisation was communicated with by our intelligence agencies. It is not that we were negligent or like that. But it is not that we have a meeting in the office today that will give us a news-item. It will not work. I am going broadly strengthened from this debate today. There is a general consensus to take action against Bofors. I am not halting at today's position. Today's debate has given me strength to take further action against Bofors. (*Interruptions*) I am just summing up. I am not misleading. I am coming to the final ...(*Interruptions*)

You don't want further action?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Prime Minister, we on our part are highly interested to find out as to who is the person or persons who have received.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I am coming to it.

My problem is that I cannot formulate a single sentence in which all the ideas can come in. I will give my reaction on various points one by one. Of course, we have done one thing. We have said that we will review the present existing contracts also. Taking the sense of the House, we will examine what further

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh

action can be taken about the present contracts also. This is the strength I draw from the House by bringing and debating his subject in the House. That is the essence of our debate. There are two existing contracts. One is the contract for supply of readymade Bofors guns. The other is the contract for licensed manufacture of those guns in the country. So far as the supply of guns is concerned, most of the part of the contract has already been fulfilled. (*Interruptions*) The payment—I can check up on that fact - that has mostly been made. This is my information. The child is born.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Whether male or female is not known.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: That is your delivery. I am not raising the question of legitimacy. But the child is there.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Because you are in minority.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: But a minority which, with your cooperation, could get a Constitutional Amendment Bill passed on the first day. I am thankful to you. So, even if a numerical minority, in thought process we can come together and with your cooperation become not only a majority but have unanimity also.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: If you implement our Congress policies, we will be with you.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: We will examine the existing contracts also in all their aspects and whatever may be the stage at which they are to date in the light of the various comments that have been made in the House.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: How long will you take?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It will not take long. It has not taken long because we initiated action right away on the 12th itself. I was asked whether I would not be scared of someone in my Cabinet. No one can be higher than the Prime Minister. I took up cudgels with him and I was not scared then when it came to the submarine matter. So, there is no scare or anything.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: This individual may be more sinister than the former Prime Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: What is raking up the mind of Mr. Subramanian Swamy may be of some Indian connection. In A.E. Services, when inquiries were made from Mr. Miles Stott. He acknowledged acquantanceship with one Shri A.C. Muthiah since student days, and Shri A.A. Rajaratnam. So, there can be some Indian connections of A.E. Services.

I do not know, because it will not be fair to me at best and jump at the conclusion in the process of enquiry. I can share the information but the process of sharing does not mean that I have concluded it. And about freezing of the accounts, the point was made. Unfortunately, the maximum case after all this was made, all this exercise was to file or make preliminary enquiries about tax evasion of Win Chadha. It is very well-known, even when I was the Finance Minister, the debate came of the deposits in Swiss banks and the IMF reports and even then, I had called for the Swiss laws, and it was very clear from those that only on the dual criminality can they take action, and tax evasion is not a criminal offence there. So, it is known at the first reading of the Swiss laws itself right from the start that as a crime under tax evasion and going to the Swiss banks for it, nothing is going to come out. Only one thing is there. On the processes of investigation, I would refrain from making a statement, maybe the accused can take a defence that there was a directive from the Government. So, I think, we should see, so far as the investigative agencies are concerned, that they conform to the law, and that should be the position vis-a-vis the investigative agen-

cies. And I am sure they will do their best on this account, and whatever steps would be necessary under the law, they will take. Now, much has been said as to why this information has not come, and why you are not telling this information and you are not telling that document. Fotedarji, at least you could have walked in and seen all the information...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Could have?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: You could have have walked into the room and seen all the information. You were in the Ministry also.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I was not supposed to see this information.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, I understand. Thank you. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I only wanted you to fulfil your commitment which you made in the Lok Sabha yesterday that you will be placing all the relevant records pertaining to this Bofors in the Prime Minister's Office on the Table of the House. Whether you were provoked or you have made the statement in a huff or otherwise, that is your concern. But you made a commitment. I wanted to request you to fulfil that commitment. That was the only thing.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Then the point is that: May I ask...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: क्या हर्षमैन आया है आपके पास।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: आ रहा हूं। आपका पत्र आ रहा है। मैं हर्षमैन पर आउंगा। सिलसिलेवार जवाब होने दीजिए, तसल्ली से रात अपनी है।

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: इनकी भेंट जरूर करायें।

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Now Dipen Ghoshji has raised the issue. He has referred to several documents and said whether they have been given to the JPC or not. Now this debate was going on for quite a few years. And while several questions have been asked on this side, there does arise a curiosity that while this debate was going on, the hon. Members opposite were in power and they could easily ask for the files and see them. They showed no cruiosity at that time.

I can understand it, curiosity was not encouraged and now after what Fotedarji has said, I was not curious, I can understand. But the point arises that in JPC there was a body of the Parliament and this was projected that here is a body, we will seek any investigation within it, outside it we will not seek and all information is to flow to JPC and others were excluded and Anand Sharmaji made a point that when the Ringberg reference was there, if there was any reference, I mean he asked the question, if there was a reference, then it was appropriate that it would go to the JPC rather than any place at the highest. It would be derogatory. May I ask, why was not Arun Singh's note sent to the JPC? Was it not derogatory? Why did not the ex-Prime Minister's noting on the very subject which you are asking today to be laid on the Table of the House, go to the JPC? Why did not the 4th July opinion of the Attorney-General go to the JPC? Was it not derogatory? Why did not the note of the Chief of the Army Staff go to the JPC? Was it not the prerogative of the highest body of the highest House? A point was raised whether the opinion given by the Attorney-General was based on full facts on which he gave this opinion in July?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Would you please yield just for a minute?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I have been yielding all the time. Let me finish and then you can ask again. Otherwise it is very difficult to present a consistent case.

Now, here I have the records to show that the defence files did go to the Attorney-General there and I have the receipt of his having received the files on the 3rd July, 1987. Then there is the

noting of the Defence Secretary saying that there were several meetings with the Attorney-General on this subject and he has got a copy of the advice from the Attorney-General on the 4th July. That means he had got the information. He applied his mind and on the 4th July, what you are mentioning, this advice was duly received and it is on the files of the Defence Ministry.

Sometimes some sort of allegations may lead to greater problems. It was said that because I have signed the files as Finance Minister, the point was made by Madan Bhatia, and therefore there is sensitivity of showing them, I am unable to show them. The files I had cleared were subject to satisfying us on all contractual, commercial and technical aspects. It was a conditional one subject to satisfying commercial and technical aspects, commercial and contractual aspects. After that the file never returned to me. It was cleared. Yes. If you want more clarifications, I can give.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Without clarifications, you signed the file? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: What could that 'satisfaction' mean, satisfaction like the one you are mentioning? Can you satisfy yourself beforehand whether money has passed hands or not? You had accorded the approval as such. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Madam, I would like to bring it to the notice of the hon. Prime Minister that this statement which he is making that his approval was conditional is not borne out even in the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Bhatia, you have already made your point.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I am stating the facts. Do you think that in the Government files, anywhere, details like names etc. in regard to underhand dealings would be mentioned; in this case, for example, what Bofors had paid?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That is exactly what I am saying. Since it cannot be there, what could that 'satisfaction' mean? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: They are normal commercial terms. They are contractual obligations. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Madam, the files are not being shown but statements are being made. This is very unfair. That is why, we want all the relevant records for a proper discussion. (*Interruptions*) Madam, this is very unfair. The record is being suppressed. Statements are made. And we have no opportunity to check and cross-check and make our comments. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He is giving the information contained in the files.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Then, let the Prime Minister produce those files which he is referring to. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I have heard you patiently. These allegations were being made by you for two years. You were in power. Your leader was the Prime Minister. Why did you not ask for the files to be tabled then? That, precisely, is the point.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Therefore, you will not do it?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Therefore, the question is ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: What is the justification? Since he did not produce the files, you will also not do it. (*Interruptions*) I did not expect such a reply from the Prime Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Because it hurts you, you do not want this reply. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister did not interrupt any

Member. Let him finish his speech. (*Interruptions*) He told Mr. Anand Sharma that he would clarify his point. He would clarify your point also.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam, when some points arise, we do have to get up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He said he would clarify. But first, let him finish his speech. Let us hear him. Let us know what he is saying. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Listen to unpalatable things also.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Dipen Ghosh wanted to know whether this information was given to the J.P.C. or not and what information had gone, what had not gone. At least in regard to those papers laid on the Table of the House, in regard to those documents, I can check up whether they went to the J.P.C. or not. I will come and inform you whether they went to the J.P.C. or not. Jethmalaniji...

श्री माखन लाल फोतेदार: वह चले गए।

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Doesn't matter. I have to answer him. He mentioned as to what should be done on the legal side. When I say that the investigating authorities will enforce the law, I do not think I have to add much on that and I will confine myself to that much only.

P.N. Sukulji asked, 'are we wiser by what has come today?' Was he aware of Mr. Arun Singh's note? Was he aware of the then Prime Minister's note? Was he aware what exactly Gen. Sundarji had written? Was he aware what the then Attorney-General had written in July? And he says that these are all old things. (*Interruptions*). No, no. You show me one page in the JPC report by which you were made wise.

3.00 A.M.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Even JPC was denied the information.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, I do not know, I will have to check it up.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Who was the person or the authority to call for the documents for JPC? Was the Government supposed to be transmitting all the files like that? Mr. Dipen Ghosh, you must understand that point. And how would those notings help JPC?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I know the process of parliamentary committees.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Do not make off-the-cuff remarks like that. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: There is one significant thing about delay and I think they should ponder on this delay also. While the noting of the ex-Prime Minister on the State Minister's note is dated 15th June which raises a host of questions of security, this and that and everything, it reaches the Defence Ministry on 21st July, five weeks later. Where was the urgency? That too, after the resignation of Mr. Arun Singh. (*Interruptions*). I am not interested in question and answer debate but I want this point to be noted. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: But the ex-Prime Minister could not be sending the file to the Defence Ministry. You should not say like that.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I am not saying, when it was done. The point here is of the movement of the file. I am not casting aspersions. I am saying, on 15th June the ex-Prime Minister signed the file and that file goes back to the Defence Ministry on 21st July at least three to five weeks later and three days after the State Minister had resigned. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: As Defence Minister you evolved the system, before it reached the ex-Prime Minister it was already leaked to the press.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I passed it then and there, that day itself it was passed. And the Army Chief, first time he gave the opinion was on 13th June. He was asked again on 15th July. Again he gave the opinion. After more than a month, after considered thought he retains his opinion on the strategic assessment of the situation.

Prof. Lakshmanaji asked very detailed questions about Pitco, Moresco and Moineau. I think this is like a maze, going into dead alleys or blind alleys, but we will try to unravel the maze. At this time this is what I can say. About aide-memoire, etc., I suppose some correspondence has taken place. Shri Anand Sharma made one point. Shri Desai also referred to the same thing. They said that the crux of the matter was that the ex-Prime Minister had jotted down. When conscience was clear why should he fear? When conscience was clear, I do not want to say anything, I won't comment at all, it is not fair to comment, but that very document ought to have gone to the JPC which is the focal point, that should have gone to JPC at least and JPC ought to have been taken into confidence on that document on which you are relying. I am making no comment whatsoever.

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग: मान्यवर, जे०पी०सी० ने जो भी कागजात सरकार के पास से मांगे हैं, कोई भी कागजात देने से सरकार ने इंकार नहीं किया है।

No, please let it be on record.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: The point is, as for the action on Bofors, the ultimate thing is finding out names and the money, and I think there is a fair consensus on that. (*Interruptions*)

राम अवधेश जी, आपके बिंदुओं का मैं जिक्र कर रहा हूं, सुनिये। ...**(व्यवधान)**... आपने यह पूछा कि जब फाइल में लिखा है कि धनराशि दी गयी है तो ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: आपके बयान से स्पष्ट नहीं होता कि किन-किन को धनराशि दी गयी?

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: अरे बैठिए, सुनिए।

उपसभापति: आपने ही तो जगाया, वह तो सो रहे थे। Why did you wake him up?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: उस बयान में है कि काफी धनराशियां दी गयीं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... फर्स्ट पेज पैराग्राफ-3.

उपसभापति: भूत उठा रहे थे, यहां दूसरा किस्सा हो गया।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: फर्स्ट पेज ...**(व्यवधान)**... बड़ी धनराशि ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI M.A. BABY (Kerala): Had I known it, I would not have woken him up.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It was better to have left him asleep. You should not have woken him up.

SHRI M.A. BABY: It is my fault ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: वह उसी आधार पर जो आडिट ब्यूरो की रिपोर्ट आई, उन्होंने धनराशियां बतायीं और कोई नाम उन्होंने नहीं बताया।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: कुछ तो बताएं न। कुछ तो आप बता दीजिए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: बोलने तो दीजिए ...**(व्यवधान)**... उसमें आपकी जानकारी के लिए स्वेंस्का, मोरेस्को, मियानो, पिटको और ए० ई० सर्विसेस ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: यहां व्यक्ति लिखा हुआ है और वह कंपनी बोल रहे हैं। आप हाउस को मिसलीड कर रहे हैं।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: नहीं-नहीं। यह ट्रांसलेशन है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: यहां व्यक्ति लिखा हुआ है और आप कहते हैं कि स्वेंस्का, मोरेस्को कंपनी के नाम बता रहे हैं। यह आपके बयान में लिखा हुआ है।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: वह भी लीगल पर्सनलटीज होती हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... तो अब इसके बाद जांच पूरी करायी जाएगी कि उनके पीछे-पीछे कौन-कौन हैं?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: यह लिखा है व्यक्ति ...**(व्यवधान)**... फिर कंपनी कैसे कहते हैं?

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: यह कौनसा पैराग्राफ-है?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: जिन व्यक्तियों के नाम हैं, वह जनता के सामने लाइए देश के सामने लाइए।

SHRI M.A. BABY: Madam, give him permission for sleeping.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Provided you do not disturb him.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: "Various persons"—I think...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: वेरियस पर्सन्स माने क्या होता है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... अंग्रेजी में वेरियस पर्सन्स हैं।

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: ..... that has to be put to companies. बात यह है कि लीगल लैंग्वेज में यूज किया है उसको। अच्छा हुआ। आपने पाइंट आउट कर दिया। लीगल लैंग्वेज यूज किया है। अच्छा हुआ आपने यह प्वाइंट-आउट कर दिया। बात साफ हो गई। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: बात साफ हो गई तो देश की जनता के सामने भी तो आए।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: तो यहां सदन में हो गई, वह तीन कम्पनियों के नाम थे। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Don't disturb me. I am talking to the Prime Minister. I have every right to seek the information. I am asking for the names because of what he has written.

श्री दीपेन घोष: क्यों आपने इनको नींद से उठाया?

उपसभापति: प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उठाया, मैंने नहीं उठाया।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: उसके सिलसिले में जो जानकारी हुई है, वह तीन कम्पनियों का स्पष्टीकरण कर रहा हूं। आपने हर्शमैन के बारे में पूछा कि आपने बुलाया है क्या? तो हर्शमैन को मैंने बुलाया नहीं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: आप भारत के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, इस तरह से इतने बड़े सवाल को हंसकर न टालिए। बहुत गंभीर सवाल है।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: हवाई जहाज से पासपोर्ट लेकर के कौन आया, यह मैं सवेरे जानकारी करता हूं? मुझे आपकी जानकारी ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: निश्चित तौर पर आपको देश को बताना होगा कि हर्शमैन आया है या नहीं आया है? इस देश में हर्शमैन आएगा और सदन में पूछा जाएगा। आप हंसकर के जवाब दे दें, यह कोई जवाब देने का तरीका नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह एक अहम सवाल है क्योंकि उसने जो कागज़ दिया है उसमें इनके कैबिनेट के ...**(व्यवधान)**... इसलिए इस कागज को नहीं रख रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: वह कागज़ होता तो कभी के रखते। **(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: यह कोई आम आदमी के आने-जाने की बात नहीं है। उसका नाम बहुत बातों के लिए यहां पहले आया है। तो सरकार को मालूम होना चाहिए कि वे इस देश में आए हैं या नहीं?

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: आपकी सरकार ने तो नाम नहीं लिया। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल: मेरे पास कोई औहदा नहीं, आप प्रधान मंत्री हैं।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: महोदया। विश्व बंधु गुप्ता, रत्नाकर पाण्डेय जी और आपने ये जो प्वाइंट रेज़ किए हैं वे उन्हीं प्वाइंट्स के अंदर है। उनका जवाब इसी के साथ आ जाता है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When he was sitting with you, he was behaving the same way. So, he cannot change. We have to suffer.

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: इन शब्दों के साथ मैं पुनः आश्वस्त करता हूं कि बोफोर्स के खिलाफ जो भी कानून के अंदर कार्रवाई है और पूरी चीजों को रिव्यू करते हुए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, मैंने जो सवाल पूछे हैं उनका जवाब नहीं आया?

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह: अभी जो हुआ है, वह रिव्यु भी किया जाएगा और उसके तहत कार्रवाई भी होगी और जानकारी करने के लिए जो भी अपनी इन्वेस्टीगेशन एजेन्सियां हैं उनको पूरी तरह से तैयार किया जाएगा कि वे पूरी जानकारी करें, उनके साथ कोई भी समझौता नहीं होगा। किसी तरह का समझौता नहीं होगा।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, मेरे किसी सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया है आपने ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam, the Prime Minister has referred to twice to what I had said earlier. Since he requested me not to seek clarifications or ask questions when he was speaking, I did not interrupt.

While referring to my mention about the enquiry from the Swedish Prosecutor-General, Mr. Ringberg, he has mentioned in his statement that the then Governemnt chose to divert it–the word is "divert"– to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, I have asked whether it was not proper for the Government to do so since the JPC was a Committee of this Parliament and it was investigating into the Bofors deal. So, does the Prime Minister consider that the action of the Government to send that paper received from the Swedish Prosecutor to the JPC was not proper? That is my question. Was it an improper act?

He has asked, "What about the note of the Chief of Army Staff and the Attorney-General?"

Madam, the hon. Prime Minister certainly has more experience than I have about the parliamentary procedures and about the functioning of the committees.

He knows that the Government of the day is required to send all what the Committee seeks or demands. I would like to be enlightened about what were the documents which the JPC had asked the then Government and did the then Government refuse to send even a single document which was demanded by the JPC. Because you asked me that is it not a fact, now I am asking you: Is it not a fact that the then Chief of the Army Staff was summoned by the JPC and he deposed before the JPC? Is it not a fact that the then Attorney General also was summoned? (*Interruptions*) I was not a member of the JPC, but their opinion was never withheld.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Along with it you read Aladi Aruna's note.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I had asked a very pointed question regarding *the return of the money: whether it is a* fact or not that the previous Government had taken effective steps that the tentative agreement for the return of Rs. 64 crores had already been reached. I had demanded that that note which was sent to the Finance Minister—the Prime Minister is available here—be placed here. You have not at all touched it. I would like to know this. This is the central issue now. The central issue is about the return of the money, about the action taken. So, I would request you to enlighten us and place that document.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Not only the return of it, but the names also. One cannot get away like...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I would like to know whether it is a fact that that note exists in the Prime Minister's Office.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will have to look into it so far.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: That means you have not looked into it so far.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Now, I have to look into it.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: It is most unfair. Why have you not looked into it? You say you have gone into all the documents, all the files. (*Interruptions*) Madam, I seek your protection. (*Interruptions*) No, I will fight my case. (*Interruptions*) It is a question of my right

and privilege as a Member of this House. (*Interruptions*) The Prime Minister's is an open Government. Your Government has promised to respect the institutions and if you really respect this august House, if you respect the institution of Indian Parlia
ment then please admit that this letter of the Finance Minister about the tentative agreement arrived at for the return of the money exists before your Government came in. Place that letter before this august House if you really respect this institution. (*Interruptions*) You have to. You cannot avoid this issue Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sharma, you asked a pertinent question to the Prime Minister, on which I cannot give a ruling. What ruling can I give? It is not a point of order.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: This House has been discussing Bofors issue for the last seven hours now. In seven hours one central question I asked... (*Interruptions*) The whole controversy is about the return of the money. That is being avoided. On the other hand it is said that the previous Government was withholding information. And this Government refuses to acknowledge the existance of that note, that crucial document. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, hon. Members. Just a minute...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Shiv Shankerji, you want to ask something.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Yes, We expected a very frank answer from the Prime Minister on the question that has been asked by Mr. Anand Sharma. But I find that he is skirting the question. Well, if this is the open Government, we would rather like to withdraw at this stage and we will walk out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber).

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Thank you very much. Now at least "Happy New Year" to all of you.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, there is one question which is agitating the minds of all of us, that is, is there a deadline which the Prime Minister would like to set?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the half-an-hour dicussion is over which lasted for a couple of hours. Now, I do not think that anybody is present for short duration discussion because those who wanted to raise are not here. We are not going to take it up.

I must inform the House that the Minister for Communications was to make a statement in the House but he has informed me that he is not well. So I would like the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to lay it on the Table of the House but he cannot answer any query.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS—Contd.

Constitution of an Expert Committee for the Assessment and Evaluation of the Centre for Development of Telematics

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. UPENDRA): Madam Deputy Chairman, on behalf of Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan, Minister of Surface Transport with additional charge of the Ministry of Communications, I lay on the Table a statement regarding constitution of an expert committee for the assessment and evaluation of the Centre for Development of Telematics (C-DOT).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the House...(*Interruptions*)...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What about short duration discussion?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Members who wanted to raise it were not present when I took it up. I asked the House but nobody was interested to raise it.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY): Madam Deputy Chairman, may I thank you for conducting the proceedings of the House with all dignity and decorum. May